Lossy Transmission of Correlated Sources over a Multiple Access Channel: Necessary Conditions and Separation Results

Başak Güler* Deniz Gündüz ** Aylin Yener*

* Department of Electrical Engineering
The Pennsylvania State University
University Park, PA
basak@psu.edu *yener@ee.psu.edu*

**Department of Electrical and Electronic Engineering
Imperial College London
London, UK
d.gunduz@imperial.ac.uk

arXiv:1612.05225v1 [cs.IT] 15 Dec 2016

Abstract

Lossy communication of correlated sources over a multiple access channel is studied. First, lossy communication is investigated in the presence of correlated decoder side information. An achievable joint source-channel coding scheme is presented, and the conditions under which separate source and channel coding is optimal are explored. It is shown that separation is optimal when the encoders and the decoder have access to a common observation conditioned on which the two sources are independent. Separation is shown to be optimal also when only the encoders have access to such a common observation whose lossless recovery is required at the decoder. Moreover, the optimality of separation is shown for sources with a common part, and sources with reconstruction constraints. Next, these results obtained for the system in presence of side information are utilized to provide a set of necessary conditions for the transmission of correlated sources over a multiple access channel without side information. The identified necessary conditions are specialized to the case of bivariate Gaussian sources over a Gaussian multiple access channel, and are shown to be tighter than known results in the literature in certain cases. Our results indicate that side information can have a significant impact on the optimality of source-channel separation in lossy transmission, in addition to being instrumental in identifying necessary conditions for the transmission of correlated sources when no side information is present.

The material in Sections III-V of this paper was presented in part at the 2016 IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory (ISIT'16).

This research is sponsored in part by the U.S. Army Research Laboratory under the Network Science Collaborative Technology Alliance, Agreement Number W911NF-09-2-0053, and by the European Research Council Starting Grant project BEACON (project number 677854).

I. Introduction

We consider the transmission of two correlated memoryless sources over a multiple access channel with fidelity criteria. The encoders and/or the decoder may have access to side information correlated with the sources. We propose an achievable joint source-channel coding scheme in the presence of correlated decoder side information. We then focus on the case when the two sources are conditionally independent given the side information available at the encoders and/or the decoder. First, we identify the necessary and sufficient conditions under which separation is optimal when the side information is shared between the encoders and the decoder. Additionally, we show that separation is optimal for sources with reconstruction constraints, when only the decoder has access to the side information conditioned on which the two sources are independent. Next, we consider the case when the decoder is required to recover the common information shared by both encoders losslessly, but can tolerate some distortion for the parts known only at a single encoder. We show that separation is also optimal for this case. We then consider the transmission of sources with a common part in the sense of Gács-Körner [1], and investigate the conditions under which separation is optimal in the absence of side information.

Next, we provide necessary conditions for the transmission of correlated sources over a multiple access channel. This is achieved by providing a particular side information to the receiver and the transmitters, and using our results for transmitting correlated sources in the presence of side information. In particular, when the two sources are independent conditioned on the side information, our initial results indicate that the necessary and sufficient conditions can be achieved by considering separate source and channel coding. For the special case of transmitting bivariate Gaussian sources over a Gaussian multiple access channel, we provide comparisons of the necessary conditions obtained from our approach with the conditions from [2] and [3]. Our results show that the proposed technique provides the tightest known bound in certain scenarios.

Related Work: Shannon proved the optimality of separate source and channel coding for transmitting a source through a noisy channel [4], known as the separation theorem. Separation was shown to be optimal for the lossy transmission of a source with decoder side information, in [5]. The point-to-point scenario was extended in [6] to transmission of correlated sources through a multiple access channel, and separation was shown to be optimal when one of the



Fig. 1. Communication of correlated sources over a multiple access channel.

sources is shared between the two encoders. For the lossless case, the optimality of separation was established in [7] for transmitting correlated sources through a multiple access channel, whenever the decoder has access to some side information conditioned on which the two sources are independent. A joint source-channel coding scheme was proposed in [8] for the transmission of correlated sources over a multiple access channel based on hybrid coding. Transmission of correlated sources in the presence of common reconstruction constraints at the encoders is considered in [9]. Necessary conditions are derived in [3] for the lossy transmission of correlated sources over a multiple access channel, and in [2] for transmitting correlated sources over a Gaussian multiple access channel.

In the remainder of the paper, X represents a random variable, and x is its realization. $X^n = (X_1, \ldots, X_n)$ is a random vector of length n, and $x^n = (x_1, \ldots, x_n)$ denotes its realization. $\mathcal{X}$ is a set with cardinality $|\mathcal{X}|$. $\mathbb{E}[X]$ is the expected value and var(X) is the variance of X.

II. System Model

Consider the transmission of two discrete memoryless sources S_1 and S_2 in Fig.1. Encoder 1 observes $S_1^n = (S_{11}, \ldots, S_{1n})$. Encoder 2 observes $S_2^n = (S_{21}, \ldots, S_{2n})$. If switch SW_2 in Fig. 1 is closed, the two encoders also have access to a common observation Z^n correlated with S_1^n and S_2^n. Encoders 1 and 2 map their observations to the channel inputs X_1^n and X_2^n, respectively. A discrete memoryless multiple access channel (DM-MAC) exists between the encoders and the decoder, characterized by the distribution $p(y|x_1, x_2)$. If switch SW_1 in Fig. 1 is closed, the decoder has access to side information Z^n. Upon observing the channel output Y^n and side

information Z^n whenever it is available, the decoder constructs $\hat{S}_1^n$, $\hat{S}_2^n$, and $\hat{Z}^n$ such that

$$\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\mathbb{E}[d_j(S_{ji},\hat{S}_{ji})] \leq D_j \text{ for } j=1,2 \tag{1}$$

where D_j is the maximum average distortion allowed for S_j, given a distortion measure $d_j(s_{ji},\hat{s}_{ji})$ for $j=1,2$, and $P(Z^n \neq \hat{Z}^n) \to 0$ as $n \to \infty$. Random variables S_1, S_2, Z, X_1, X_2, Y, $\hat{S}_1$, $\hat{S}_2$, $\hat{Z}$ are defined over the corresponding alphabets $\mathcal{S}_1$, $\mathcal{S}_2$, $\mathcal{Z}$, $\mathcal{X}_1$, $\mathcal{X}_2$, $\mathcal{Y}$, $\hat{\mathcal{S}}_1$, $\hat{\mathcal{S}}_2$, $\hat{\mathcal{Z}}$. Note that, when the switch SW_1 is closed, error probability in decoding Z^n becomes irrelevant since it is readily available at the decoder, and serves as side information.

We use the following notation from [5], [6]. Define the minimum average distortion for S_j given Q as

$$\mathcal{E}(S_j|Q) = \min_{f:Q\to\hat{\mathcal{S}}_j} E[d_j(S_j,f(Q))], \quad j=1,2, \tag{2}$$

and the conditional rate distortion function [10] for source S_j when side information Z is shared between the encoder and the decoder as

$$R_{S_j|Z}(D_j) = \min_{\substack{p(u_j|s_j,z)\\ \mathcal{E}(S_j|U_j,Z)\leq D_j}} I(S_j;U_j|Z), \quad j=1,2. \tag{3}$$

III. Joint Source-Channel Coding with Decoder Side Information

We first assume that only SW_1 is closed, and present a general achievable scheme for the lossy communication of correlated sources in the presence of decoder side information.

Theorem 1. *The distortion pair (D_1,D_2) is achievable for sending two discrete memoryless correlated sources S_1 and S_2 over a DM-MAC with $p(y|x_1,x_2)$ and decoder side information Z if there exists a joint distribution $p(u_1,u_2,s_1,s_2,z)=p(u_1|s_1)p(u_2|s_2)p(s_1,s_2,z)$, and functions $x_j(u_j,s_j)$, $g_j(u_1,u_2,y,z)$ for $j=1,2$, such that*

$$I(U_1;S_1|U_2,Z) < I(U_1;Y|U_2,Z) \tag{4}$$

$$I(U_2;S_2|U_1,Z) < I(U_2;Y|U_1,Z) \tag{5}$$

$$I(U_1,U_2;S_1,S_2|Z) < I(U_1,U_2;Y|Z) \tag{6}$$

and $\mathbb{E}[d_j(S_j,g_j(U_1,U_2,Y,Z))] \leq D_j$ for $j=1,2$.

Proof: Our achievable scheme builds upon the hybrid coding framework of [8], by generalizing it to the case with decoder side information. The detailed proof is available in Appendix A. ■

For the remainder of this section, we assume that the sources are independent when conditioned on the side information, i.e., the Markov condition $S_1 - Z - S_2$ holds.

A. Optimality of Separation

We now focus on the conditions under which separation is optimal when sources S_1 and S_2 are independent given the side information Z.

1) Decoder Side Information Available at the Encoder: We first consider that both switches in Fig. 1 are closed. We show that whenever the two sources are independent given the side information that is shared between the encoders and the decoder, separation is optimal. The next theorem states the necessary and sufficient conditions.

Theorem 2. *Consider the communication of two correlated sources S_1 and S_2 with side information Z shared between the encoders and the decoder. If $S_1 - Z - S_2$ form a Markov chain, then separate source and channel coding is optimal, and a distortion pair (D_1, D_2) is achievable if*

$$R_{S_1|Z}(D_1) < I(X_1; Y|X_2, Q) \tag{7}$$

$$R_{S_2|Z}(D_2) < I(X_2; Y|X_1, Q) \tag{8}$$

$$R_{S_1|Z}(D_1) + R_{S_2|Z}(D_2) < I(X_1, X_2; Y|Q) \tag{9}$$

for some $p(x_1, x_2, y, q) = p(y|x_1, x_2)p(x_1|q)p(x_2|q)p(q)$.

Conversely, for any achievable (D_1, D_2) pair, (7)-(9) *must hold with $<$ replaced with $\leq$.*

Proof: See Appendix B. ■

When side information Z is available only at the decoder, i.e., when only switch SW_1 is closed, separation is known to be optimal for the lossless transmission of sources S_1 and S_2 whenever $S_1 - Z - S_2$ [7]. In light of Theorem 2, we show that a similar result holds for the lossy case whenever the Wyner-Ziv rate distortion function of each source is equal to its conditional rate distortion function.

Corollary 1. *Consider communication of two correlated sources S_1 and S_2 with decoder only side information Z. If*

$$R_{S_j|Z}(D_j) = R^{\text{WZ}}_{S_j|Z}(D_j), \tag{10}$$

where

$$R^{\text{WZ}}_{S_j|Z}(D_j) = \min_{\substack{p(u_j|s_j), g(u_j,z) \\ \mathbb{E}[d_j(S_j,g(U_j,Z))] \leq D_j \\ U_j - S_j - Z}} I(S_j; U_j|Z) \text{ for } j = 1, 2$$

is the (Wyner-Ziv) rate distortion function of S_j with decoder-only side information Z [11], and $S_1 - Z - S_2$ form a Markov chain, then separation is optimal, with the necessary and sufficient conditions stated in (7)-(9)*.*

Corollary 1 follows from the fact that whenever (10) holds, conditional rate distortion functions in Theorem 2 are achievable by relying on decoder side information only.

Remark 1. *Gaussian sources are an example for* (10)*. For instance, let (S_1, S_2, Z) denote a zero-mean Gaussian random vector. Then, separation is optimal, from the necessary and sufficient conditions stated in Theorem 2, if and only if*

$$i) \quad \frac{\mathbb{E}[S_1S_2]\mathbb{E}[Z^2] - \mathbb{E}[S_1Z]\mathbb{E}[S_2Z]}{\mathbb{E}[S_2^2]\mathbb{E}[Z^2] - \mathbb{E}^2[S_2Z]} = 0 \tag{11}$$

$$ii) \quad \frac{\mathbb{E}[S_1Z]}{\mathbb{E}[Z^2]} = \frac{\mathbb{E}[S_1Z]\mathbb{E}[S_2^2] - \mathbb{E}[S_1S_2]\mathbb{E}[S_2Z]}{\mathbb{E}[S_2^2]\mathbb{E}[Z^2] - \mathbb{E}^2[S_2Z]} \tag{12}$$

$$iii) \quad \frac{\mathbb{E}^2[S_1Z]}{\mathbb{E}[Z^2]} = \frac{\mathbb{E}^2[S_1S_2]\mathbb{E}[Z^2] + \mathbb{E}^2[S_1S_3]\mathbb{E}[S_2^2]}{\mathbb{E}[S_2^2]\mathbb{E}[Z^2] - \mathbb{E}^2[S_2Z]} - \frac{2\mathbb{E}[S_1S_2]\mathbb{E}[S_1S_3]\mathbb{E}[S_2S_3]}{\mathbb{E}[S_2^2]\mathbb{E}[Z^2] - \mathbb{E}^2[S_2Z]} \tag{13}$$

are satisfied.

Proof: Please see Appendix C for the details. ■

2) Sources with Reconstruction Constraints: We next consider transmission of correlated sources (S_1, S_2) over a multiple access channel with reconstruction constraints in the presence of decoder side information Z such that $S_1 - Z - S_2$, and show that separation is optimal in this scenario. Accordingly, we consider in this section the system model illustrated in Fig. 2 with $S_1 - Z - S_2$. In addition to the encoding function $e_j : \mathcal{S}_j^n \to \mathcal{X}_j^n$ and decoding function



Fig. 2. Communication of correlated sources over a multiple access channel with reconstruction constraints.

$g_j : \mathcal{Y}^n \times \mathcal{Z}^n \to \hat{\mathcal{S}}_j^n$ such that

$$\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n} \mathbb{E}[d_j(S_{ji}, \hat{S}_{ji})] \leq D_j \text{ for } j = 1, 2, \tag{14}$$

define the reconstruction constraints as in [9], by considering a reconstruction mapping $\psi_j : \mathcal{S}_j^n \to \bar{\mathcal{S}}_j^n$ for encoder $j = 1, 2$, such that,

$$P(\bar{S}_j^n \neq \hat{S}_j^n) \to 0 \text{ as } n \to \infty. \tag{15}$$

Theorem 3. *For the lossy transmission of correlated sources (S_1, S_2) over a MAC with reconstruction constraints from* (15) *in the presence of decoder side information Z such that $S_1 - Z - S_2$, separation is optimal, and a distortion pair (D_1, D_2) is achievable if*

$$R_{S_1|Z}^{RC}(D_1) < I(X_1; Y|X_2, Q) \tag{16}$$

$$R_{S_2|Z}^{RC}(D_2) < I(X_2; Y|X_1, Q) \tag{17}$$

$$R_{S_1|Z}^{RC}(D_1) + R_{S_2|Z}^{RC}(D_2) < I(X_1, X_2; Y|Q) \tag{18}$$

where $p(y, x_1, x_2, q) = p(y|x_1, x_2)p(x_1|q)p(x_2|q)p(q)$, and for $j = 1, 2$,

$$R_{S_j|Z}^{RC}(D_j) \triangleq \min_{\substack{p(\hat{s}_j|s_j) \\ \mathbb{E}[d(S_j,\hat{S}_j)] \leq D_j \\ \hat{S}_j - S_j - Z}} I(\hat{S}_j; S_j|Z) \tag{19}$$

is the lossy source coding rate of a single source with decoder side information and reconstruction constraint [9]. Conversely, for any achievable distortion pair (D_1, D_2) with reconstruction constraints in (15)*, the conditions* (16)-(18) *must hold with $<$ replaced with $\leq$.*

Proof: We provide the proof in Appendix D. ■

IV. Separation in the Presence of Common Observation

In this section, we assume that only switch SW_2 is closed in Fig. 1, and show the optimality of separation whenever lossless reconstruction of the common observation is required.

Theorem 4. *Consider the communication of correlated sources S_1, S_2, and Z, where Z is observed by both encoders. If $S_1 - Z - S_2$ form a Markov chain, and Z is to be reconstructed at the receiver in a lossless fashion, then, separate source and channel coding is optimal, and the distortion pair (D_1, D_2) is achievable if*

$$R_{S_1|Z}(D_1) < I(X_1; Y|X_2, W) \tag{20}$$

$$R_{S_2|Z}(D_2) < I(X_2; Y|X_1, W) \tag{21}$$

$$R_{S_1|Z}(D_1) + R_{S_2|Z}(D_2) < I(X_1, X_2; Y|W) \tag{22}$$

$$H(Z) + R_{S_1|Z}(D_1) + R_{S_2|Z}(D_2) < I(X_1, X_2; Y) \tag{23}$$

for some $p(x_1, x_2, y, w) = p(y|x_1, x_2)p(x_1|w)p(x_2|w)p(w)$.

Conversely, if a distortion pair (D_1, D_2) is achievable, then (20)-(23) *must hold with $<$ replaced with $\leq$.*

Proof: We provide a detailed proof in Appendix E. ■

Corollary 2. *A special case of Theorem 4 is the transmission of two sources over a DM-MAC with one distortion criterion, when one source is available at both encoders as considered in [6], which corresponds to S_2 being a constant in Theorem 4.*

V. Separation for Sources with a Common Part

In this section, we assume that both switches in Fig. 1 are open, $Z =$ constant, and study the conditions under which separate source and channel coding is optimal for transmitting sources with a common part. We first review two notions that quantify common information between correlated sources.

Definition 1. *(Gács-Körner common information) [1] Define the function $f_j : \mathcal{S}_j \to \{1, \ldots, k\}$ for $j = 1, 2$ with the largest integer k such that $P(f_j(S_j) = u_0) > 0$ for $u_0 \in \{1, \ldots, k\}$,*

$j = 1, 2$ *and* $P(f_1(S_1) = f_2(S_2)) = 1$. *Then,* $U_0 = f_1(S_1) = f_2(S_2)$ *is defined as the common part between* S_1 *and* S_2*, and the Gács-Körner common information is given by*

$$C_{GK}(S_1, S_2) = H(U_0). \tag{24}$$

Definition 2. *(Wyner's common information) [12] Wyner's common information between* S_1 *and* S_2 *is defined as,*

$$C_W(S_1, S_2) = \min_{\substack{p(v|s_1,s_2) \\ S_1 - V - S_2}} I(S_1, S_2; V). \tag{25}$$

Remark 2. $C_{GK}(S_1, S_2) = C_W(S_1, S_2)$ *if and only if there exists a random variable* U_0 *such that* U_0 *is the common part of* S_1 *and* S_2 *from Definition 1, and* $S_1 - U_0 - S_2$ *[1], [12].*

We first state a separation result when common information is available as side information at the decoder.

Corollary 3. *Consider the transmission of two sources* S_1 *and* S_2 *with a common part* $U_0 = f_1(S_1) = f_2(S_2)$ *from Definition 1. Then, separation is optimal whenever*

$$C_{GK}(S_1, S_2) = C_W(S_1, S_2), \tag{26}$$

and the common part U_0 *is available at the decoder.*

We know from Remark 2 that whenever (26) holds, then $S_1 - U_0 - S_2$, where U_0 is the common part of S_1 and S_2 as in Definition 1. Since the two encoders can extract U_0 individually, each encoder can achieve the corresponding conditional rate distortion function in which U_0 is shared between the encoder and the decoder. Corollary 3 then follows from Theorem 2 by letting $Z \leftarrow U_0$.

Our next result states that whenever Gács-Körner common information between two sources is equal to Wyner's common information, then separate source and channel coding is optimal if lossless reconstruction of the common part is required.

Corollary 4. *Consider the transmission of two correlated sources* S_1 *and* S_2 *with a common part* $U_0 = f_1(S_1) = f_2(S_2)$ *from Definition 1. Let* $C_{GK}(S_1, S_2) = C_W(S_1, S_2)$ *and the common part* U_0 *of* S_1 *and* S_2 *is to be recovered losslessly. Then, separate source and channel coding is*



Fig. 3. Correlated sources over a MAC.

optimal.

We have from Definition 1 that the two encoders can separately reconstruct U_0, and from Remark 2 that $S_1 - U_0 - S_2$. Then, the result follows from letting $Z \leftarrow U_0$ in Theorem 4.

VI. A necessary Condition for the Transmission of Correlated Sources over a MAC

We consider in this section the lossy transmission of correlated sources over a multiple access channel without any side information at the receiver, i.e., both switches in Fig. 1 are assumed to be open; see Fig. 3. We provide necessary conditions for the achievability of a distortion pair (D_1, D_2) using our results from Section III. This will be achieved by providing a correlated side information to the encoders and the receiver, conditioned on which the two sources are independent. From Theorem 2, separation is optimal in this setting, and the corresponding necessary and sufficient conditions for the achievability of a distortion pair serve as necessary conditions for the original problem. A set of necessary conditions for transmitting correlated sources over a MAC is presented in Theorem 5 below.

We then specialize the necessary conditions to the transmission of correlated Gaussian sources over a Gaussian multiple access channel, and provide comparisons between the obtained necessary conditions with those presented in [2] and [3] for the same scenario.

Theorem 5. *Consider the communication of two correlated sources S_1 and S_2 over a MAC. If a distortion pair (D_1, D_2) is achievable for sources (S_1, S_2) and channel $p(y|x_1, x_2)$, then for*

every Z, for which $S_1 - Z - S_2$ form a Markov chain, we have

$$R_{S_1|Z}(D_1) \leq I(X_1; Y|X_2, Q), \tag{27}$$

$$R_{S_2|Z}(D_2) \leq I(X_2; Y|X_1, Q), \tag{28}$$

$$R_{S_1|Z}(D_1) + R_{S_2|Z}(D_2) \leq I(X_1, X_2; Y|Q), \tag{29}$$

$$R_{S_1S_2}(D_1, D_2) \leq I(X_1, X_2; Y), \tag{30}$$

for some Q for which $X_1 - Q - X_2$ form a Markov chain, where

$$R_{S_1S_2}(D_1, D_2) = \min_{\substack{p(\hat{s}_1,\hat{s}_2|s_1,s_2) \\ \mathbb{E}[d_1(S_1,\hat{S}_1)]\leq D_1 \\ \mathbb{E}[d_2(S_2,\hat{S}_2)]\leq D_2}} I(S_1, S_2; \hat{S}_1, \hat{S}_2)$$

is the rate distortion function of the joint source (S_1, S_2) with target distortions D_1 and D_2 for sources S_1 and S_2, respectively.

Proof: For any Z that satisfies the Markov chain condition, we consider the genie-aided setting in which Z^n is provided to both the encoders and the decoder. Then, we obtain the setting in Theorem 2. Conditions (27)-(29) follow from Theorem 2, whereas condition (30) follows from the cut-set bound. ■

By relaxing conditions (27) and (28), we obtain the following necessary conditions.

Corollary 5. *If a distortion pair (D_1, D_2) is achievable for sources (S_1, S_2), then for every Z that forms a Markov chain $S_1 - Z - S_2$, we have*

$$R_{S_1|Z}(D_1) + R_{S_2|Z}(D_2), \leq I(X_1, X_2; Y|Q) \tag{31}$$

$$R_{S_1S_2}(D_1, D_2) \leq I(X_1, X_2; Y), \tag{32}$$

for some Q such that $X_1 - Q - X_2$.

In the following, we compare the necessary conditions in Corollary 5 with the necessary conditions obtained by Lapidoth and Wigger in [3], and the necessary conditions obtained by Lapidoth and Tinguely in [2] for the transmission of Gaussian sources over a Gaussian MAC.

To do so, we consider a bivariate Gaussian source (S_1, S_2) such that

$$\begin{pmatrix} S_1 \\ S_2 \end{pmatrix} \sim \mathcal{N}\left(\begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 1 & \rho \\ \rho & 1 \end{pmatrix} \right), \tag{33}$$

and a memoryless MAC with additive Gaussian noise:

$$Y = X_1 + X_2 + N, \tag{34}$$

where N is a standard Gaussian random variable. We impose input power constraints $\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n} \mathbb{E}[X_{ji}^2] \leq P$, $j = 1, 2$, and consider squared error distortion functions $d_j(S_j, \hat{S}_j) = (S_j - \hat{S}_j)^2$ for $j = 1, 2$.

First, we consider the necessary conditions from Corollary 5. From [13], for the Gaussian MAC, we have

$$I(X_1, X_2; Y|Q) \leq \frac{1}{2}\log(1 + \beta_1 P + \beta_2 P) \tag{35}$$

$$I(X_1, X_2; Y) \leq \frac{1}{2}\log(1 + 2P + 2P\sqrt{(1-\beta_1)(1-\beta_2)}) \tag{36}$$

for some $0 \leq \beta_1, \beta_2 \leq 1$. From Corollary 5 along with (35) and (36), we obtain the following necessary conditions for the Gaussian example.

Corollary 6. *If a distortion pair (D_1, D_2) is achievable for sources (S_1, S_2) over a Gaussian MAC given in* (34)*, then for every Z that forms a Markov chain $S_1 - Z - S_2$, we have*

$$R_{S_1|Z}(D_1) + R_{S_2|Z}(D_2) \leq \frac{1}{2}\log(1 + \beta_1 P + \beta_2 P) \tag{37}$$

$$R_{S_1S_2}(D_1, D_2) \leq \frac{1}{2}\log(1 + 2P + 2P\sqrt{(1-\beta_1)(1-\beta_2)}) \tag{38}$$

for some $0 \leq \beta_1, \beta_2 \leq 1$.

Next, observe that the Lapidoth-Tinguely necessary condition for this example is

$$R_{S_1S_2}(D_1, D_2) \leq \frac{1}{2}\log(1 + 2P(1+\rho)) \tag{39}$$

from [2, Theorem IV.1].

Lastly, we obtain the Lapidoth-Wigger necessary conditions from [3, Corollary 1.1] and (35)-

(36) for this example as follows,

$$R_{S_1S_2}(D_1, D_2) - \frac{1}{2}\log\frac{1+\rho}{1-\rho} \leq \frac{1}{2}\log(1+\beta_1 P + \beta_2 P) \tag{40}$$

$$R_{S_1S_2}(D_1, D_2) \leq \frac{1}{2}\log(1+2P+2P\sqrt{(1-\beta_1)(1-\beta_2)}) \tag{41}$$

for some $0 \leq \beta_1, \beta_2 \leq 1$, since for the Gaussian source $C_W(S_1, S_2) = \frac{1}{2}\log\frac{1+\rho}{1-\rho}$ from [12].

In the following, we compare the necessary conditions from Corollary 6 with (39) and (40)-(41) for Gaussian sources. To do so, we let Z in Corollary 6 to be the common part of (S_1, S_2) with respect to Wyner's common information from (25). From [14, Proposition 1], the common part can be characterized as follows. Let Z, N_1, and N_2 be standard random variables. Then, S_1, and S_2 can be expressed as

$$S_1 = \sqrt{\rho}Z + \sqrt{1-\rho}N_1 \tag{42}$$

$$S_2 = \sqrt{\rho}Z + \sqrt{1-\rho}N_2 \tag{43}$$

such that $I(S_1, S_2; Z) = \frac{1}{2}\log\frac{1+\rho}{1-\rho}$ and $I(S_1, S_2; Z') > \frac{1}{2}\log\frac{1+\rho}{1-\rho}$ for all $S_1 - Z' - S_2$ for which $Z' \neq Z$.

The rate distortion function for source S_1 with encoder and decoder side information Z is,

$$R_{S_1|Z}(D_1) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{2}\log\frac{1-\rho}{D_1} & \text{if} \quad 0 < D_1 < 1-\rho \\ 0 & \text{if} \quad D_1 \geq 1-\rho \end{cases} \tag{44}$$

from [15]. Similarly,

$$R_{S_2|Z}(D_2) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{2}\log\frac{1-\rho}{D_2} & \text{if} \quad 0 < D_2 < 1-\rho \\ 0 & \text{if} \quad D_2 \geq 1-\rho \end{cases}. \tag{45}$$

Therefore,

$$R_{S_1|Z}(D_1) + R_{S_2|Z}(D_2) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{2}\log\frac{(1-\rho)^2}{D_1 D_2} & \text{if} \quad 0 < D_1 < 1-\rho, \quad 0 < D_2 < 1-\rho \\ \frac{1}{2}\log\frac{1-\rho}{D_1} & \text{if} \quad 0 < D_1 < 1-\rho, \quad D_2 \geq 1-\rho \\ \frac{1}{2}\log\frac{1-\rho}{D_2} & \text{if} \quad D_1 \geq 1-\rho, \quad 0 < D_2 < 1-\rho \\ 0 & \text{if} \quad D_1 \geq 1-\rho, \quad D_2 \geq 1-\rho \end{cases}. \tag{46}$$



Fig. 4. Regions $\mathcal{D}_1$, $\mathcal{D}_2$, and $\mathcal{D}_3$.

We also have, from [2], [16], that,

$$R_{S_1S_2}(D_1,D_2)=\begin{cases}\frac{1}{2}\log\left(\frac{1}{\min(D_1,D_2)}\right) & \text{if } (D_1,D_2)\in\mathcal{D}_1\\ \frac{1}{2}\log^+\left(\frac{1-\rho^2}{D_1D_2}\right) & \text{if } (D_1,D_2)\in\mathcal{D}_2\\ \frac{1}{2}\log^+\left(\frac{1-\rho^2}{D_1D_2-\left(\rho-\sqrt{(1-D_1)(1-D_2)}\right)^2}\right) & \text{if } (D_1,D_2)\in\mathcal{D}_3\end{cases}, \tag{47}$$

where $\log^+(x)=\max\{0,\log(x)\}$ and

$$\mathcal{D}_1=\Big\{(D_1,D_2):(0\le D_1\le 1-\rho^2, D_2\ge 1-\rho^2+\rho^2D_1) \text{ or } \Big(1-\rho^2<D_1\le 1, D_2\ge 1-\rho^2+\rho^2D_1, D_2\le\frac{D_1-(1-\rho^2)}{\rho^2}\Big)\Big\} \tag{48}$$

$$\mathcal{D}_2=\Big\{(D_1,D_2):0\le D_1\le 1-\rho^2, 0\le D_2<(1-\rho^2-D_1)\frac{1}{1-D_1}\Big\} \tag{49}$$

$$\mathcal{D}_3=\Big\{(D_1,D_2):\Big(0\le D_1\le 1-\rho^2,(1-\rho^2-D_1)\frac{1}{1-D_1}\le D_2<1-\rho^2+\rho^2D_1\Big) \text{ or } \Big(1-\rho^2<D_1\le 1,\frac{D_1-(1-\rho^2)}{\rho^2}<D_2<1-\rho^2+\rho^2D_1\Big)\Big\} \tag{50}$$

Fig. 4 illustrates the regions $\mathcal{D}_1$, $\mathcal{D}_2$, and $\mathcal{D}_3$ as in [2].

In Fig. 5 and 6, we compare the necessary conditions from Corollary 6, (39), and (40)-(41) for the Gaussian example. To do so, we let the horizontal axis refer to D_2 and the vertical axis refer to D_1. Then, for each D_2 value, we evaluate and plot the minimum D_1 value that satisfies



Fig. 5. Comparison of the necessary conditions from Corollary 6 with Lapidoth-Tinguely (LT) and Lapidoth-Wigger (LW) necessary conditions from (39) and (40)-(41), respectively, for $\rho = 0.2$, $P = 10$, and $0.05 \leq D_2 \leq 1$.

the corresponding necessary conditions, numerically. Accordingly, these values correspond to a lower bound on the achievable D_1 values for a given D_2. The higher the corresponding curve, the tighter the lower bound. We refer to the condition from (39) as LT, and the condition from (40)-(41) as LW [1].

Fig. 5 corresponds to a Gaussian example with $\rho = 0.2$ and $P = 10$. Fig. 6, on the other hand, corresponds to a Gaussian example for which $\rho = 0.5$ and $P = 10$. Fig. 5 and Fig. 6 suggest that the necessary condition from Corollary 6 provides the tightest bound in various regions, particularly, for large values of D_2.

In the following, we show that there exist (D_1, D_2) values for which Corollary 6 gives the tightest bound, by analyzing the corresponding expressions from Corollary 6, (39), and (40)-(41). To do so, we define

$$r_1(\beta_1, \beta_2) \triangleq \frac{1}{2}\log(1 + 2P + 2P\sqrt{(1-\beta_1)(1-\beta_2)}), \tag{51}$$

[1]We note that the bound obtained here from (40)-(41) slightly differs from the one reported in (15) in [3] due to a minor error in [3].



Fig. 6. Comparison of the necessary conditions from Corollary 6 with Lapidoth-Tinguely (LT) and Lapidoth-Wigger (LW) necessary conditions from (39) and (40)-(41), for $\rho = 0.5$, $P = 10$, and $0.05 \leq D_2 \leq 1$.

$$r_2(\beta_1, \beta_2) \triangleq \frac{1}{2}\log(1 + \beta_1 P + \beta_2 P), \tag{52}$$

and consider the region

$$\mathcal{R} = \bigcup_{0 \leq \beta_1, \beta_2 \leq 1} \{(R_1, R_2) : R_1 \leq r_1(\beta_1, \beta_2), R_2 \leq r_2(\beta_1, \beta_2)\}. \tag{53}$$

Then, the necessary conditions in Corollary 6 state that, if a distortion pair is achievable, then

$$\big(R_{S_1S_2}(D_1, D_2), R_{S_1|Z}(D_1) + R_{S_2|Z}(D_2)\big) \in \mathcal{R}. \tag{54}$$

The necessary conditions from (40)-(41), on the other hand, state that, if a distortion pair (D_1, D_2) is achievable, then

$$\left(R_{S_1S_2}(D_1, D_2), R_{S_1S_2}(D_1, D_2) - \frac{1}{2}\log\frac{1+\rho}{1-\rho}\right) \in \mathcal{R}. \tag{55}$$

In the following, we let $\rho = 0.5$ and $P = 2$. We partition the set of all distortion pairs (D_1, D_2), $0 \leq D_1, D_2 \leq 1$, as in Fig. 7. Consider first Region $\mathcal{B}$, for which $D_1 \leq 1 - \rho$ and $1 - \rho \leq D_2 \leq \frac{1-\rho^2-D_1}{1-D_1}$. We let $D_1 = 0.14 < 1 - \rho$. For a (D_1, D_2) pair in Region $\mathcal{B}$, i.e.,



Fig. 7. Partitioned distortion regions for (D_1, D_2).

$D_1 = 0.14$ and $1-\rho \leq D_2 \leq \frac{1-\rho^2-D_1}{1-D_1}$, from (46) and (47) we have

$$\left(R_{S_1S_2}(D_1,D_2), R_{S_1|Z}(D_1)+R_{S_2|Z}(D_2)\right) = \left(\frac{1}{2}\log\frac{1-\rho^2}{D_1D_2}, \frac{1}{2}\log\frac{1-\rho}{D_1}\right). \tag{56}$$

The points obtained for increasing D_2 values within Region $\mathcal{B}$ are illustrated with a green "+" sign in Fig. 8. On the other hand, the region $\mathcal{R}$ from (53) is the region shaded in blue in the same figure. Whenever a green point from (56) falls outside the blue region $\mathcal{R}$, then we conclude that the corresponding distortion pair (D_1, D_2) is not achievable, according to Corollary 6. We also evaluate

$$\left(R_{S_1S_2}(D_1,D_2), R_{S_1S_2}(D_1,D_2) - \frac{1}{2}\log\frac{1+\rho}{1-\rho}\right) = \left(\frac{1}{2}\log\frac{1-\rho^2}{D_1D_2}, \frac{1}{2}\log\frac{(1-\rho)^2}{D_1D_2}\right) \tag{57}$$

for points $(0.14, D_2)$ in Region $\mathcal{B}$, using (47). The points for different D_2 values are illustrated with a dark blue "*" marking in Fig. 8. Accordingly, whenever such a point from (57) is not contained within $\mathcal{R}$ from (53), then the corresponding distortion pair (D_1, D_2) is not achievable, according to the LW conditions from (40)-(41).

Next, we consider (D_1, D_2) pairs from Region $\mathcal{D}$, for which $D_1 \leq 1-\rho$ and $\frac{1-\rho^2-D_1}{1-D_1} \leq D_2 \leq 1-\rho^2+\rho^2 D_1$. We can evaluate

$$\left(R_{S_1S_2}(D_1,D_2), R_{S_1|Z}(D_1)+R_{S_2|Z}(D_2)\right)$$



Fig. 8. Comparison of the necessary conditions from Corollary 6 with LT and LW necessary conditions from (39) and (40)-(41), respectively, for $P = 2$, $\rho = 0.5$, and $D_1 = 0.14$.



Fig. 9. Comparison of the necessary conditions from Corollary 6 with LT and LW necessary conditions from (39) and (40)-(41), respectively, for $P = 2$, $\rho = 0.5$, and $D_1 = 0.145$.

$$= \left(\frac{1}{2} \log^+ \left(\frac{1-\rho^2}{D_1 D_2 - \left(\rho - \sqrt{(1-D_1)(1-D_2)}\right)^2} \right), \frac{1}{2} \log \frac{1-\rho}{D_1} \right) \tag{58}$$

using (46) and (47). The values obtained for $D_1 = 0.14$ and D_2 going from $\frac{1-\rho^2-D_1}{1-D_1}$ to $1 - \rho^2 + \rho^2 D_1$ are illustrated with a purple "+" sign in Fig. 8. Similarly, from (47), for $(D_1, D_2) \in$ Region $\mathcal{D}$,



Fig. 10. Comparison of the necessary conditions from Corollary 6 with LT and LW necessary conditions from (39) and (40)-(41), respectively, for $P = 2$, $\rho = 0.5$, and $D_1 = 0.15$.



Fig. 11. Comparison of the necessary conditions from Corollary 6 with LT and LW necessary conditions from (39) and (40)-(41), respectively, for $P = 2$, $\rho = 0.5$, and $D_1 = 0.16$.

$$\left(R_{S_1S_2}(D_1,D_2), R_{S_1S_2}(D_1,D_2) - \frac{1}{2}\log\frac{1+\rho}{1-\rho}\right)$$
$$= \left(\frac{1}{2}\log^+\left(\frac{1-\rho^2}{D_1D_2 - \left(\rho - \sqrt{(1-D_1)(1-D_2)}\right)^2}\right), \frac{1}{2}\log^+\left(\frac{(1-\rho)^2}{D_1D_2 - \left(\rho - \sqrt{(1-D_1)(1-D_2)}\right)^2}\right)\right). \quad (59)$$

Corresponding points for $D = 0.14$ and increasing D_2 values in Region $\mathcal{D}$ are illustrated with

a red "x" marking in Fig. 8.

Finally, we consider Region $\mathcal{G}$, where $D_1 \leq 1-\rho$ and $1-\rho^2+\rho^2 D_1 \leq D_2 \leq 1$. For $(D_1, D_2) \in$ Region $\mathcal{G}$, we have

$$\left(R_{S_1S_2}(D_1,D_2), R_{S_1|Z}(D_1)+R_{S_2|Z}(D_2)\right) = \left(\frac{1}{2}\log\frac{1}{D_1}, \frac{1}{2}\log\frac{1-\rho}{D_1}\right). \tag{60}$$

Corresponding points are illustrated with the pink "+" sign in Fig. 8. Note that since (60) depends only on D_1, these points coincide and appear as a single point in Fig. 8. We also evaluate

$$\left(R_{S_1S_2}(D_1,D_2), R_{S_1S_2}(D_1,D_2)-\frac{1}{2}\log\frac{1+\rho}{1-\rho}\right) = \left(\frac{1}{2}\log\frac{1}{D_1}, \frac{1}{2}\log\frac{1-\rho}{D_1(1+\rho)}\right) \tag{61}$$

for $1-\rho^2+\rho^2 D_1 \leq D_2 \leq 1$ using (47). This is illustrated with a black "*" marking in Fig. 8. Since (61) also depends only on D_1, these points coincide and appear as a single point.

One can observe from (56)-(57), as well as from (58)-(59) and (60)-(61), that the points that share the same value on the horizontal axis in Fig. 8 correspond to the same (D_1, D_2) pairs, as the first terms of both (56)-(57) and (58)-(59) as well as (60)-(61) are equal.

Lastly, we illustrate the right-hand side (RHS) of (39) with a straight line in Fig. 8. It can be observed from (39) that the points on the RHS of this line correspond to distortion pairs (D_1, D_2) that are not achievable, based on the necessary condition in (39), since for these points one has

$$R_{S_1S_2}(D_1,D_2) > \frac{1}{2}\log(1+2P(1+\rho)). \tag{62}$$

In Figs. 9, 10, and 11, we illustrate the corresponding regions for $D_1 = 0.145$, $D_1 = 0.15$, and $D_1 = 0.16$, respectively, by keeping the remaining parameters fixed.

In order to compare the necessary conditions in Corollary 6 with LT and LW necessary conditions, we investigate the distortion pairs (D_1, D_2) that cannot be achieved by Corollary 6, (39), and (40)-(41), respectively, in Figs. 8, 9, 10, and 11. From Fig. 8 we observe that when $P = 0.14$, for all the (D_1, D_2) pairs considered, Corollary 6 and the LT bound from (39) both state that none of these distortion pairs is achievable, whereas some distortion pairs satisfy the necessary conditions for the LW bound from (40)-(41), as several points labeled with a "x" marking fall into the blue region $\mathcal{R}$. From Fig. 9, we find that when $D_1 = 0.145$, some (D_1, D_2) pairs from Regions $\mathcal{G}$ and $\mathcal{D}$ (from Fig. 7) satisfy both LT and LW conditions from (39) and (40)-(41), but not Corollary 6, as can be observed from the pink and purple points marked with

the "+" sign that are on the left-hand side (LHS) of the straight line, but outside the blue region $\mathcal{R}$. Fig. 10 demonstrates similar results for $D_1 = 0.15$. Therefore, we can conclude that there exist distortion pairs for which Corollary 6 provides tighter conditions than both the LT and LW bounds in Regions $\mathcal{G}$ and $\mathcal{D}$. Similarly, from Fig. 10, we find that for $D_1 = 0.16$, there exist (D_1, D_2) pairs in Region $\mathcal{B}$ that satisfy the necessary conditions from LT and LW but not from Corollary 6, which can be observed from the green points marked with the "+" sign that are on the LHS of the straight line but are outside the blue region $\mathcal{R}$. Hence, for Region $\mathcal{B}$ we also observe that there exist distortion pairs for which Corollary 6 provides tighter conditions than both the LT bound from (39) and the LW necessary conditions from (40)-(41).

In the following, we compare Corollary 6 with the LW conditions from (40)-(41) by investigating the LHS of both conditions for various regions in Fig. 7, as the region defined by the RHS of both (37)-(38) and (40)-(41) are the same.

For $(D_1, D_2) \in \mathcal{A}$, we observe from (46) and (47) that,

$$R_{S_1S_2}(D_1, D_2) - C_W(S_1, S_2) = \frac{1}{2}\log\left(\frac{1-\rho^2}{D_1D_2}\right) - \frac{1}{2}\log\left(\frac{1+\rho}{1-\rho}\right) \tag{63}$$

$$= \frac{1}{2}\log\frac{(1-\rho)^2}{D_1D_2}$$

$$= R_{S_1|Z}(D_1) + R_{S_2|Z}(D_2), \tag{64}$$

hence, in this region, Corollary 6 and the LW bound are equivalent.

For $(D_1, D_2) \in \mathcal{B}$, we find from (46) and (47) that,

$$R_{S_1S_2}(D_1, D_2) - C_W(S_1, S_2) = \frac{1}{2}\log\left(\frac{1-\rho^2}{D_1D_2}\right) - \frac{1}{2}\log\left(\frac{1+\rho}{1-\rho}\right) \tag{65}$$

$$= \frac{1}{2}\log\frac{(1-\rho)^2}{D_1D_2} \tag{66}$$

$$\leq \frac{1}{2}\log\frac{1-\rho}{D_1} \tag{67}$$

$$= R_{S_1|Z}(D_1) + R_{S_2|Z}(D_2), \tag{68}$$

since $D_1 \leq 1-\rho$ and $D_2 \geq 1-\rho$ for $(D_1, D_2) \in \mathcal{B}$. Hence, in this region, Corollary 6 is at least as tight as the LW bound. By swapping the roles of D_1 and D_2, we can extend the same argument to Region $\mathcal{C}$ as well.

For $(D_1, D_2) \in \mathcal{D}$, we have from (46) and (47) that,

$$R_{S_1|Z}(D_1) + R_{S_2|Z}(D_2) = \frac{1}{2}\log\frac{1-\rho}{D_1}, \tag{69}$$

whereas

$$\begin{aligned}
&R_{S_1S_2}(D_1, D_2) - C_W(S_1, S_2) \\
&\quad= \frac{1}{2}\max\left\{\log\frac{1-\rho}{1+\rho}, \log\frac{(1-\rho)^2}{D_1D_2 - \left(\rho - \sqrt{(1-D_1)(1-D_2)}\right)^2}\right\} &(70)\\
&\quad= \frac{1}{2}\max\left\{\log\frac{1-\rho}{1+\rho}, \log\frac{(1-\rho)^2}{D_1 + D_2 - (1+\rho^2) + 2\rho\sqrt{(1-D_1)(1-D_2)}}\right\} &(71)\\
&\quad= \frac{1}{2}\log\frac{(1-\rho)^2}{D_1 + D_2 - (1+\rho^2) + 2\rho\sqrt{(1-D_1)(1-D_2)}} &(72)
\end{aligned}$$

where the last equation follows from

$$\begin{aligned}
(2 - D_1 - D_2)^2 - 4\rho^2(1-D_1)(1-D_2) &= (1-\rho^2)(2-D_1-D_2)^2 + \rho^2(D_1-D_2)^2 &(73)\\
&\geq 0 &(74)
\end{aligned}$$

and therefore,

$$D_1 + D_2 - (1+\rho^2) + 2\rho\sqrt{(1-D_1)(1-D_2)} \leq 1 - \rho^2. \tag{75}$$

Then, by comparing (72) with (69), we find that, Corollary 6 provides necessary conditions at least as tight as the LW bound if

$$\rho \in \left\{\rho : \tau - \sqrt{D_2 - 1 + \tau^2} \leq \rho \leq \tau + \sqrt{D_2 - 1 + \tau^2}, \quad D_2 + \tau^2 \geq 1\right\} \tag{76}$$

where

$$\tau = \frac{D_1}{2} + \sqrt{(1-D_1)(1-D_2)}. \tag{77}$$

By symmetry, it then follows for region $(D_1, D_2) \in \mathcal{F}$ that, Corollary 6 is at least as tight as the LW bound if

$$\rho \in \left\{\rho : \lambda - \sqrt{D_1 - 1 + \lambda^2} \leq \rho \leq \lambda + \sqrt{D_1 - 1 + \lambda^2}, \quad D_1 + \tau^2 \geq 1\right\}, \tag{78}$$

where

$$\lambda = \frac{D_2}{2} + \sqrt{(1-D_1)(1-D_2)}. \tag{79}$$

For $(D_1, D_2) \in \mathcal{G}$, we observe from (46) and (47) that,

$$R_{S_1S_2}(D_1, D_2) - C_W(S_1, S_2) = \frac{1}{2}\log\left(\frac{1}{D_1}\right) - \frac{1}{2}\log\left(\frac{1+\rho}{1-\rho}\right) \tag{80}$$

$$= \frac{1}{2}\log\frac{1-\rho}{D_1(1+\rho)} \tag{81}$$

$$\leq \frac{1}{2}\log\frac{1-\rho}{D_1} \tag{82}$$

$$= R_{S_1|Z}(D_1) + R_{S_2|Z}(D_2). \tag{83}$$

Therefore, Corollary 6 is again at least as tight as the LW bound. It follows by symmetry that Corollary 6 is at least as tight as the LW bound in Region $\mathcal{I}$ as well.

For $(D_1, D_2) \in \mathcal{H}$, we have from (46) and (47) that,

$$R_{S_1S_2}(D_1, D_2) - C_W(S_1, S_2) = \frac{1}{2}\log\left(\frac{1}{\min(D_1, D_2)}\right) - \frac{1}{2}\log\left(\frac{1+\rho}{1-\rho}\right) \tag{84}$$

$$= \frac{1}{2}\log\frac{1-\rho}{\min(D_1, D_2)(1+\rho)} \tag{85}$$

$$\leq 0 \tag{86}$$

$$= R_{S_1|Z}(D_1) + R_{S_2|Z}(D_2) \tag{87}$$

since $\min(D_1, D_2) \geq 1-\rho$ when $(D_1, D_2) \in H$. From (86), we find that both condition (37) and condition (41) are trivially satisfied in this region, and therefore Corollary 6 and the LW bound are equivalent. Same conclusion follows for Region $\mathcal{J}$.

For region $(D_1, D_2) \in \mathcal{E}$, we have from (46) and (47) that,

$$R_{S_1|Z}(D_1) + R_{S_2|Z}(D_2) = 0, \tag{88}$$

hence, condition (37) is trivially satisfied, whereas $R_{S_1S_2}(D_1, D_2) - C_W(S_1, S_2)$ is as given in (70) and (72).

If $D_1 = D_2$, we have from (70) and $D_1 \geq 1-\rho$ that,

$$R_{S_1S_2}(D_1, D_2) - C_W(S_1, S_2) = \frac{1}{2}\max\left\{\log\frac{1-\rho}{1+\rho}, \log\frac{(1-\rho)^2}{D_1^2 - (\rho-(1-D_1))^2}\right\} \tag{89}$$

$$= \frac{1}{2}\max\left\{\log\frac{1-\rho}{1+\rho}, \log\frac{(1-\rho)^2}{(1-\rho)(2D_1-(1-\rho))}\right\} \tag{90}$$

$$\leq 0 \tag{91}$$

$$= R_{S_1|Z}(D_1) + R_{S_2|Z}(D_2), \tag{92}$$

and (41) is also trivially satisfied. Hence, for all $D_1 = D_2$ in Region $\mathcal{E}$, Corollary 6 and the LW bound perform the same.

We next consider the case when $\rho \leq 0.5$ for $(D_1, D_2) \in E$. Without loss of generality, we assume that $D_1 \geq D_2$. Noting that $D_2 \geq 1-\rho$, we have

$$D_1 + D_2 - (1+\rho^2) + 2\rho\sqrt{(1-D_1)(1-D_2)} \geq D_1 + D_2 - (1+\rho^2) + 2\rho(1-D_1) \tag{93}$$

$$= D_1(1-2\rho) + D_2 - (1-\rho)^2 \tag{94}$$

$$\geq D_2(1-2\rho) + D_2 - (1-\rho)^2 \tag{95}$$

$$= (1-\rho)(2D_2 - (1-\rho)) \tag{96}$$

$$\geq (1-\rho)^2 \tag{97}$$

from which, along with (88) and (72), we find that

$$R_{S_1S_2}(D_1, D_2) - C_W(S_1, S_2) \leq 0 = R_{S_1|Z}(D_1) + R_{S_2|Z}(D_2). \tag{98}$$

Therefore, for all $\rho \leq 0.5$, Corollary 6 and the LW bound perform the same. By comparing (88) with (72), in general we can show that, Corollary 6 and the LW bound perform the same if

$$\rho \in \left\{\rho : \Delta - \sqrt{\frac{D_1+D_2}{2} - 1 + \Delta^2} \leq \rho \leq \Delta + \sqrt{\frac{D_1+D_2}{2} - 1 + \Delta^2},\ \frac{D_1+D_2}{2} + \Delta^2 \geq 1\right\} \tag{99}$$

where

$$\Delta = \frac{1 + \sqrt{(1-D_1)(1-D_2)}}{2} \tag{100}$$

We can therefore state that the necessary conditions from Corollary 6 are at least as tight as those suggested by the LW bound in all regions but Region $\mathcal{E}$, Region $\mathcal{D}$, and Region $\mathcal{F}$. We remark that this does not necessarily mean that Corollary 6 is strictly tighter in any of these regions, since the necessary conditions involve also the RHS of (37)-(38) and (40)-(41), and

they can be used to claim the impossibility of achieving certain distortion pairs based on the relative value of the rate distortion functions with respect to the rate region characterized by the RHS. It is possible that, even though the LHS of Corollary 6 is lower than the LHS of the LW bound, either both or none of the necessary conditions may be satisfied, leading exactly to the same conclusion regarding the achievability of the corresponding distortion pair. On the other hand, while we have shown numerically cases where Corollary 6 provides strictly tighter bounds than the LW conditions, we have not come across any case in which the opposite holds, that is, the LW conditions show that a certain distortion pair is not achievable, while the necessary conditions of Corollary 6 hold.

VII. Conclusion

We have considered lossy transmission of correlated sources over a multiple access channel. We have investigated the conditions under which separate source and channel coding is optimal when the encoder and/or decoder has access to side information. In addition, we have derived necessary conditions for the lossy transmission of correlated sources over a multiple access channel. We have shown that this technique provides in certain cases the tightest known necessary conditions for the Gaussian setting, i.e., Gaussian sources transmitted over a Gaussian MAC. Current and future directions include identifying other multiple access scenarios for which separation is (sub)optimal as well as the same for other multi-terminal scenarios with side information.

Appendix A
Proof of Theorem 1

Our achievable scheme is along the lines of [8]. For completeness, we provide the details in the sequel.

Generation of the codebook: Choose $\epsilon > \epsilon' > 0$. Fix $p(u_1|s_1)$, $p(u_2|s_2)$, $x_1(u_1, s_1)$, $x_2(u_2, s_2)$, $\hat{s}_1(u_1, u_2, y, z)$ and $\hat{s}_2(u_1, u_2, y, z)$ with $\mathbb{E}[d_j(S_j, \hat{S}_j)] \leq \frac{D_j}{1+\epsilon}$ for $j = 1, 2$.

For each $j = 1, 2$, generate 2^{nR_j} sequences $u_j^n(m_j)$ for $m_j \in \{1, \ldots, 2^{nR_j}\}$ independently at random conditioned on the distribution $\prod_{i=1}^n p_{U_j}(u_{ji})$. The codebook is known by the two encoders and the decoder.

Encoding: Encoder $j = 1, 2$ observes a sequence s_j^n and tries to find an index $m_j \in \{1, \ldots, 2^{nR_j}\}$ such that the corresponding $u_j^n(m_j)$ is jointly typical with s_j^n, i.e., $(s_j^n, u_j^n(m_j)) \in \mathcal{T}_{\epsilon'}^{(n)}$. If more than one index exist, the encoder selects one of them uniformly at random. If no such index exists, it selects a random index uniformly. Upon selecting the index, encoder j sends $x_{ji} = x_j(u_{ji}(m_j), s_{ji})$ for $i = 1, \ldots, n$ to the decoder.

Decoding: The decoder observes the channel output y^n and side information z^n, and tries to find a unique pair of indices $(\hat{m}_1, \hat{m}_2)$ such that $(u_1^n(\hat{m}_1), u_2^n(\hat{m}_2), y^n, z^n) \in \mathcal{T}_\epsilon^{(n)}$ and sets $\hat{s}_{ji} = \hat{s}_j(u_{1i}(m_1), u_{2i}(m_2), y_i, z_i)$ for $i = 1, \ldots, n$ for $j = 1, 2$.

Expected Distortion Analysis: Let M_1 and M_2 denote the indices selected by encoder 1 and encoder 2. Define

$$\mathcal{E}\{(S_1^n, S_2^n, U_1^n(\hat{M}_1), U_2^n(\hat{M}_2), Y^n, Z^n) \notin \mathcal{T}_\epsilon^{(n)}\} \tag{101}$$

such that the distortion pair (D_1, D_2) is satisfied if $P(\mathcal{E}) \to 0$ as $n \to \infty$. Let

$$\mathcal{E}_j = \{(S_j^n, U_j^n(m_j)) \notin \mathcal{T}_{\epsilon'}^{(n)} \ \ \forall m_j\}, \quad j = 1, 2 \tag{102}$$

$$\mathcal{E}_3 = \{(S_1^n, S_2^n, U_1^n(M_1), U_2^n(M_2), Y^n, Z^n) \notin \mathcal{T}_\epsilon^{(n)}\} \tag{103}$$

$$\mathcal{E}_4 = \{(U_1^n(m_1), U_2^n(m_2), Y^n, Z^n) \in \mathcal{T}_\epsilon^{(n)} \text{ for some } m_1 \neq M_1, m_2 \neq M_2\} \tag{104}$$

$$\mathcal{E}_5 = \{(U_1^n(m_1), U_2^n(M_2), Y^n, Z^n) \in \mathcal{T}_\epsilon^{(n)} \text{ for some } m_1 \neq M_1\} \tag{105}$$

$$\mathcal{E}_6 = \{(U_1^n(M_1), U_2^n(m_2), Y^n, Z^n) \in \mathcal{T}_\epsilon^{(n)} \text{ for some } m_2 \neq M_2\} \tag{106}$$

Then,

$$P(\mathcal{E}) \leq P(\mathcal{E}_1) + P(\mathcal{E}_2) + P(\mathcal{E}_3 \cap \mathcal{E}_1^c \cap \mathcal{E}_2^c) + P(\mathcal{E}_4) + P(\mathcal{E}_5) + P(\mathcal{E}_6). \tag{107}$$

We have for $j = 1, 2$ that $P(\mathcal{E}_j) \to 0$ as $n \to \infty$ if

$$R_j > I(U_j; S_j) + \delta(\epsilon'), \tag{108}$$

from the covering lemma [17].

We have from the Markov lemma [17, Section 12.1.1] that $P(\mathcal{E}_3) \to 0$ as $n \to \infty$. In particular, the result follows from applying Markov lemma to: i) $U_2 - S_2 - S_1 Z$, ii) $U_1 - S_1 - S_2 U_2 Z$, iii) $Y - U_1 U_2 S_1 S_2 - Z$ in the given order.

We next define the event $\mathcal{M} = \{M_1 = 1, M_2 = 1\}$. From the symmetry of the codebook and

the encoding procedure, we have that

$$P(\mathcal{E}_4) = P(\mathcal{E}_4|\mathcal{M}) \leq \sum_{m_1=2}^{2^{nR_1}} \sum_{m_1=2}^{2^{nR_2}} \sum_{(u_1^n,u_1^n,y^n,z^n)\in\mathcal{T}_\epsilon^{(n)}} P\{U_1^n(m_1)=u_1^n, U_2^n(m_2)=u_2^n, Y^n=y^n, Z^n=z^n|\mathcal{M}\} \tag{109}$$

where (109) is from the union bound. By denoting $\tilde{U}^n = (U_1^n(1), U_2^n(1), S_1^n, S_2^n)$ and $\tilde{u} = (\tilde{u}_1^n, \tilde{u}_2^n, s_1^n, s_2^n)$, we observe the following.

$$P\{U_1^n(m_1)=u_1^n, U_2^n(m_2)=u_2^n, Y^n=y^n, Z^n=z^n|\mathcal{M}\}$$
$$= \sum_{\tilde{u}^n} P\{U_1^n(m_1)=u_1^n, U_2^n(m_2)=u_2^n, Y^n=y^n, Z^n=z^n, \tilde{U}^n=\tilde{u}^n|\mathcal{M}\} \tag{110}$$
$$= \sum_{\tilde{u}^n} P\{\tilde{U}^n=\tilde{u}^n|Y^n=y^n, Z^n=z^n, \mathcal{M}\}$$
$$P\{U_1^n(m_1)=u_1^n, U_2^n(m_2)=u_2^n|Y^n=y^n, Z^n=z^n, \tilde{U}^n=\tilde{u}^n, \mathcal{M}\} P\{Y^n=y^n, Z^n=z^n|\mathcal{M}\} \tag{111}$$

Given $\mathcal{M}$, we have for all $m_1 \neq 1$ and $m_2 \neq 1$, $U_1^n(m_1)U_2^n(m_2) - U_1^n(1)U_2^n(1)S_1^nS_2^n - Y^nZ^n$. Then, (111) is equal to

$$\sum_{\tilde{u}^n} P\{U_1^n(m_1)=u_1^n|\mathcal{M}, \tilde{U}^n=\tilde{u}^n\} P\{U_2^n(m_2)=u_2^n|\mathcal{M}, U_1^n(m_1)=u_1^n, \tilde{U}^n=\tilde{u}^n\}$$
$$P\{\tilde{U}^n=\tilde{u}^n|Y^n=y^n, Z^n=z^n, \mathcal{M}\} P\{Y^n=y^n, Z^n=z^n|\mathcal{M}\} \tag{112}$$
$$= \sum_{\tilde{u}^n} P\{U_1^n(m_1)=u_1^n|M_1=1, U_1^n(1)=\tilde{u}_1^n, S_1^n=s_1^n\} P\{U_2^n(m_2)=u_2^n|M_2=1, U_2^n(1)=\tilde{u}_2^n, S_2^n=s_2^n\}$$
$$P\{\tilde{U}^n=\tilde{u}^n|Y^n=y^n, Z^n=z^n, \mathcal{M}\} P\{Y^n=y^n, Z^n=z^n|\mathcal{M}\} \tag{113}$$
$$\leq (1+\epsilon) \sum_{\tilde{u}^n} \Big(\prod_{i=1}^n p_{U_1}(u_{1i}) p_{U_2}(u_{2i}) \Big) P\{\tilde{U}^n=\tilde{u}^n|Y^n=y^n, Z^n=z^n, \mathcal{M}\} P\{Y^n=y^n, Z^n=z^n|\mathcal{M}\} \tag{114}$$
$$= (1+\epsilon) \Big(\prod_{i=1}^n p_{U_1}(u_{1i}) p_{U_2}(u_{2i}) \Big) P\{Y^n=y^n, Z^n=z^n|\mathcal{M}\} \tag{115}$$

where (113) follows from the independent encoding protocol and (114) follows from Lemma 1

in [8] by setting $U \leftarrow U_1$, $S \leftarrow S_1$, and $M \leftarrow M_1$ and then setting $U \leftarrow U_2$, $S \leftarrow S_2$, and $M \leftarrow M_2$.

Using (115), we write (109) as follows.

$$P(\mathcal{E}_4)$$

$$\leq (1+\epsilon) \sum_{m_1=2}^{2^{nR_1}} \sum_{m_1=2}^{2^{nR_2}} \sum_{(u_1^n, u_1^n, y^n, z^n) \in \mathcal{T}_\epsilon^{(n)}} p(u_1^n) p(u_2^n) P\{Y^n = y^n, Z^n = z^n | \mathcal{M}\} \tag{116}$$

$$\leq (1+\epsilon) 2^{n(R_1+R_2)} \sum_{(y^n, z^n) \in \mathcal{T}_\epsilon^{(n)}} P\{Y^n = y^n, Z^n = z^n | \mathcal{M}\} \sum_{u_1 \in \mathcal{T}_\epsilon^{(n)}(U_1|y^n, z^n)} p(u_1^n) \sum_{u_2^n \in \mathcal{T}_\epsilon^{(n)}(U_2|u_1^n, y^n, z^n)} p(u_2^n) \tag{117}$$

$$\leq (1+\epsilon) 2^{n(R_1+R_2)} \sum_{(y^n, z^n) \in \mathcal{T}_\epsilon^{(n)}} P\{Y^n = y^n, Z^n = z^n | \mathcal{M}\} \sum_{u_1 \in \mathcal{T}_\epsilon^{(n)}(U_1|y^n, z^n)} p(u_1^n) |\mathcal{T}_\epsilon^{(n)}(U_2|u_1^n, y^n, z^n)| 2^{-n(H(U_2)-\delta(\epsilon))} \tag{118}$$

$$\leq (1+\epsilon) 2^{n(R_1+R_2)} \sum_{(y^n, z^n) \in \mathcal{T}_\epsilon^{(n)}} P\{Y^n = y^n, Z^n = z^n | \mathcal{M}\} \sum_{u_1 \in \mathcal{T}_\epsilon^{(n)}(U_1|y^n, z^n)} p(u_1^n) 2^{n(H(U_2|U_1,Y,Z)+\delta(\epsilon))} 2^{-n(H(U_2)-\delta(\epsilon))} \tag{119}$$

$$\leq (1+\epsilon) 2^{n(R_1+R_2)} \sum_{(y^n, z^n) \in \mathcal{T}_\epsilon^{(n)}} P\{Y^n = y^n, Z^n = z^n | \mathcal{M}\} 2^{n(H(U_1|Y,Z)+\delta(\epsilon))} 2^{-n(H(U_1)-\delta(\epsilon))} 2^{n(H(U_2|U_1,Y,Z)-H(U_2)+2\delta(\epsilon))} \tag{120}$$

$$\leq (1+\epsilon) 2^{n(R_1+R_2)} 2^{n(H(U_1|Y,Z)+H(U_2|U_1,Y,Z)-H(U_1)-H(U_2)+4\delta(\epsilon))} \tag{121}$$

where in (117) we define

$$\mathcal{T}_\epsilon^{(n)}(U_1|y^n, z^n) = \{u_1^n : (u_1^n, y^n, z^n) \in \mathcal{T}_\epsilon^{(n)}\} \tag{122}$$

and

$$\mathcal{T}_\epsilon^{(n)}(U_2|u_1^n, y^n, z^n) = \{u_2^n : (u_2^n, u_1^n, y^n, z^n) \in \mathcal{T}_\epsilon^{(n)}\} \tag{123}$$

as in [17, Section 2.5.1]. Since

$$\begin{aligned}
&H(U_1|Y,Z)+H(U_2|U_1,Y,Z)-H(U_1)-H(U_2)\\
&\quad=H(U_1,U_2|Y,Z)-H(U_1)-H(U_2) &(124)\\
&\quad=H(U_1,U_2|Y,Z)-H(U_1)-H(U_2)+H(U_1,U_2)-H(U_1,U_2) &(125)\\
&\quad=-(H(U_1,U_2)-H(U_1,U_2|Y,Z))-H(U_1)-H(U_2)+H(U_1)+H(U_2|U_1) &(126)\\
&\quad=-I(U_1,U_2;Y,Z)-I(U_1;U_2) &(127)
\end{aligned}$$

we observe from (121) and (127) that, if

$$R_1+R_2<I(U_1,U_2;Y,Z)+I(U_1;U_2)-4\delta(\epsilon) \tag{128}$$

then, $P(\mathcal{E}_4)\to 0$ as $n\to\infty$.

Similarly, we observe for (105) that

$$\begin{aligned}
P(\mathcal{E}_5)&=P(\mathcal{E}_5|\mathcal{M})\\
&=P\{(U_1^n(m_1),U_2^n(1),Y^n,Z^n)\in\mathcal{T}_\epsilon^{(n)}\text{ for some }m_1\neq 1|\mathcal{M}\} &(129)\\
&\le\sum_{m_1=2}^{2^{nR_1}}P\{(U_1^n(m_1),U_2^n(1),Y^n,Z^n)\in\mathcal{T}_\epsilon^{(n)}|\mathcal{M}\} &(130)\\
&=\sum_{m_1=2}^{2^{nR_1}}\sum_{(u_1^n,u_2^n,y^n,z^n)\in\mathcal{T}_\epsilon^{(n)}}P\{U_1^n(m_1)=u_1^n,U_2^n(1)=u_2^n,Y^n=y^n,Z^n=z^n|\mathcal{M}\} &(131)
\end{aligned}$$

by letting $\tilde{U}^n=(U_1^n(1),S_1^n,S_2^n)$ and $\tilde{u}^n=(\tilde{u}_1^n,s_1^n,s_2^n)$, we find that

$$\begin{aligned}
&P\{U_1^n(m_1)=u_1^n,U_2^n(1)=u_2^n,Y^n=y^n,Z^n=z^n|\mathcal{M}\}\\
&=\sum_{\tilde{u}^n}\{U_1^n(m_1)=u_1^n,U_2^n(1)=u_2^n,Y^n=y^n,Z^n=z^n,\tilde{U}^n=\tilde{u}^n|\mathcal{M}\} &(132)\\
&=\sum_{\tilde{u}^n}P\{U_1^n(m_1)=u_1^n|U_2^n(1)=u_2^n,\tilde{U}^n=\tilde{u}^n,\mathcal{M}\}\\
&\quad\times P\{\tilde{U}^n=\tilde{u}^n|U_2^n(1)=u_2^n,Y^n=y^n,Z^n=z^n,\mathcal{M}\}P\{U_2^n(1)=u_2^n,Y^n=y^n,Z^n=z^n|\mathcal{M}\} &(133)
\end{aligned}$$

$$= \sum_{\tilde{u}^n} P\{U_1^n(m_1) = u_1^n | M_1 = 1, U_1^n(1) = u_1^n, S_1^n = s_1^n\}$$
$$\times P\{\tilde{U}^n = \tilde{u}^n | U_2^n(1) = u_2^n, Y^n = y^n, Z^n = z^n, \mathcal{M}\} P\{U_2^n(1) = u_2^n, Y^n = y^n, Z^n = z^n | \mathcal{M}\} \tag{134}$$

$$= (1+\epsilon) \sum_{\tilde{u}^n} \Big(\prod_{i=1}^{n} p_{U_1}(u_{1i}) \Big)$$
$$\times P\{\tilde{U}^n = \tilde{u}^n | U_2^n(1) = u_2^n, Y^n = y^n, Z^n = z^n, \mathcal{M}\} P\{U_2^n(1) = u_2^n, Y^n = y^n, Z^n = z^n | \mathcal{M}\} \tag{135}$$

$$= (1+\epsilon) \Big(\prod_{i=1}^{n} p_{U_1}(u_{1i}) \Big) P\{U_2^n(1) = u_2^n, Y^n = y^n, Z^n = z^n | \mathcal{M}\} \tag{136}$$

where (133) is from $U_1^n(m_1) - U_2^n(1) U_1^n(1) S_1^n S_2^n \mathcal{M} - Y^n Z^n$, (134) is from the independent encoding protocol, and (135) is again from Lemma 1 in [8].

Using (136), we can write (131) as

$$P(\mathcal{E}_5)$$
$$\leq (1+\epsilon) \sum_{m_1=2}^{2^{nR_1}} \sum_{(u_1^n, u_2^n, y^n, z^n) \in \mathcal{T}_\epsilon^{(n)}} p(u_1^n) P\{Y^n = y^n, Z^n = z^n, U_2^n(1) = u_2^n | \mathcal{M}\} \tag{137}$$
$$= (1+\epsilon) \sum_{m_1=2}^{2^{nR_1}} \sum_{(y^n, z^n, u_2^n) \in \mathcal{T}_\epsilon^{(n)}} P\{Y^n = y^n, Z^n = z^n, U_2^n(1) = u_2^n | \mathcal{M}\} \sum_{u_1^n \in \mathcal{T}_\epsilon^{(n)}(U_1 | y^n, z^n, u_2^n)} p(u_1^n) \tag{138}$$
$$\leq (1+\epsilon) \sum_{m_1=2}^{2^{nR_1}} \sum_{(y^n, z^n, u_2^n) \in \mathcal{T}_\epsilon^{(n)}} P\{Y^n = y^n, Z^n = z^n, U_2^n(1) = u_2^n | \mathcal{M}\} 2^{n(H(U_1|Y,Z,U_2) + \delta(\epsilon))} 2^{-n(H(U_1) - \delta(\epsilon))} \tag{139}$$
$$= (1+\epsilon) 2^{nR_1} 2^{-n(I(U_1; Y, Z, U_2) - 2\delta(\epsilon))} \tag{140}$$

hence, $P(\mathcal{E}_5) \to 0$ as $n \to \infty$ if

$$R_1 < I(U_1; Y, Z, U_2) - 2\delta(\epsilon). \tag{141}$$

From similar steps, we find that $P(\mathcal{E}_6) \to 0$ as $n \to \infty$ if

$$R_2 < I(U_2; Y, Z, U_1) - 2\delta(\epsilon). \tag{142}$$

Therefore, we conclude that $P(\mathcal{E}) \to 0$ as $n \to \infty$ as $P(\mathcal{E}_i) \to 0$ for $i = 1, \ldots, 6$ as $n \to \infty$. Lastly, from the typical average lemma [17, Section 2.4], we can bound the expected distortions for $\mathcal{E}^c$ for the two sources S_1 and S_2.

Lastly, we combine the conditions (108), (141), (142) and (128) to obtain (4)-(6) as follows.

Combining (108) and (141), we can show that

$$I(U_1; S_1) < I(U_1; Y, Z, U_2) \tag{143}$$

leads to (4), since

$$\begin{aligned} I(U_1; Y|Z, U_2) &> I(U_1; S_1) - I(U_1; Z, U_2) && (144)\\ &= H(U_1) - H(U_1|S_1) - H(U_1) + H(U_1|Z, U_2) && (145)\\ &= H(U_1) - H(U_1|S_1, Z, U_2) - H(U_1) + H(U_1|Z, U_2) && (146)\\ &= I(U_1; S_1|U_2, Z) && (147) \end{aligned}$$

where (146) is from $U_1 - S_1 - ZU_2$.

Similarly, by combining (142) and (108), we obtain (5),

$$I(U_2; S_2|U_1, Z) < I(U_2; Y|Z, U_1). \tag{148}$$

Lastly, by comparing (108) and (128) we obtain

$$I(S_1; U_1) + I(S_2; U_2) < I(U_1, U_2; Y, Z) + I(U_1; U_2) \tag{149}$$

which leads to

$$I(S_1;U_1)+I(S_2;U_2)-I(U_1,U_2;Z)-I(U_1;U_2)<I(U_1,U_2;Y|Z) \tag{150}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} &I(S_1; U_1) + I(S_2; U_2) - I(U_1, U_2; Z) - I(U_1; U_2) && (151)\\ &\quad = H(U_1) - H(U_1|S_1) + H(U_2) - H(U_2|S_2) - H(U_1, U_2)\\ &\qquad + H(U_1, U_2|Z) - H(U_2) + H(U_2|U_1) + H(U_1) - H(U_1) && (152)\\ &\quad = H(U_1, U_2|Z) - H(U_1|S_1) - H(U_2|S_2) && (153) \end{aligned}$$

$$= H(U_1, U_2|Z) - H(U_1|S_1, S_2) - H(U_2|S_2, S_1, U_1) \tag{154}$$

$$= H(U_1, U_2|Z) - H(U_1, U_2|S_2, S_1) \tag{155}$$

$$= H(U_1, U_2|Z) - H(U_1, U_2|S_2, S_1, Z) \tag{156}$$

$$= I(U_1, U_2; S_2, S_1|Z) \tag{157}$$

(154) is from $U_1 - S_1 - S_2$ and $U_2 - S_2 - S_1U_1$, (156) is from $U_1U_2 - S_1S_2 - Z$.

Combining (157) and (150), we conclude that (149) yields (6), i.e.,

$$I(U_1, U_2; S_2, S_1|Z) < I(U_1, U_2; Y|Z). \tag{158}$$

APPENDIX B
PROOF OF THEOREM 2

A. Achievability

The source coding part is based on lossy source coding at the two encoders conditioned on the side information Z shared between the encoder and decoder [10], after which the conditional rate distortion functions given in (3) can be achieved for S_1 and S_2, respectively. The channel coding part is performed based on classical multiple access channel coding with independent channel inputs [18].

B. Converse

Suppose there exist encoding functions $e_j : \mathcal{S}_j^n \times \mathcal{Z}^n \to \mathcal{X}_j^n$ for encoder $j = 1, 2$, and decoding functions $g_j : \mathcal{Y}^n \times \mathcal{Z}^n \to \hat{\mathcal{S}}_j^n$ such that $\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n E[d_j(S_{ji}, \hat{\mathcal{S}}_{ji})] \leq D_j + \epsilon$ for $j = 1, 2$, where $\epsilon \to 0$ as $n \to \infty$.

Define $U_{ji} = (Y^n, S_j^{i-1}, Z_i^c)$ for $j = 1, 2$, where $Z_i^c = (Z_1, \ldots, Z_{i-1}, Z_{i+1}, \ldots, Z_n)$. Then,

$$\frac{1}{n}I(X_1^n; Y^n|X_2^n, Z^n) \geq \frac{1}{n}I(S_1^n; Y^n|X_2^n, Z^n) \tag{159}$$

$$= \frac{1}{n}I(S_1^n; Y^n, X_2^n|Z^n) \tag{160}$$

$$\geq \frac{1}{n}I(S_1^n; Y^n|Z^n) \tag{161}$$

$$= \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n I(S_{1i}; Y^n|S_1^{i-1}, Z^n) \tag{162}$$

$$= \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n}(I(S_{1i}; Y^n, S_1^{i-1}, Z_i^c|Z_i) - I(S_{1i}; S_1^{i-1}, Z_i^c|Z_i)) \tag{163}$$

$$= \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n} I(S_{1i}; U_{1i}|Z_i) \tag{164}$$

$$\geq \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n} R_{S_1|Z}(\mathcal{E}(S_{1i}|U_{1i}, Z_i)) \tag{165}$$

$$\geq \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n} R_{S_1|Z}(\mathcal{E}(S_{1i}|Z^n, Y^n)) \tag{166}$$

$$\geq \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n} R_{S_1|Z}(E[d_1(S_{1i}, \hat{S}_{1i})]) \tag{167}$$

$$\geq R_{S_1|Z}(D_1 + \epsilon) \tag{168}$$

(159) is from $Y^n - X_1^n X_2^n - S_1^n Z^n$ and conditioning cannot increase entropy, and (160) is from $X_2^n - Z^n - S_1^n$ which holds since

$$p(x_2^n, s_1^n|z^n) = \sum_{s_2^n} p(x_2^n, s_1^n, s_2^n|z^n) \tag{169}$$

$$= \sum_{s_2^n} p(x_2^n|s_1^n, s_2^n, z^n)p(s_1^n|z^n)p(s_2^n|z^n) \tag{170}$$

$$= \sum_{s_2^n} p(x_2^n|s_2^n, z^n)p(s_1^n|z^n)p(s_2^n|z^n) \tag{171}$$

$$= \sum_{s_2^n} p(x_2^n, s_2^n|z^n)p(s_1^n|z^n) \tag{172}$$

$$= p(x_2^n|z^n)p(s_1^n|z^n) \tag{173}$$

where (170) is from $S_1^n - Z^n - S_2^n$ and (171) is from $X_2^n - S_2^n Z^n - S_1^n$. Equation (161) is from the nonnegativity of mutual information; (162) is from the chain rule; (164) is from the definition of U_{1i} and the memoryless property of the sources and the side information. Equation (165) is from (2) and (3); (166) is from the fact that further conditioning cannot increase (2); (167) follows since $\hat{S}_{1i}$ is a function of (Y^n, Z^n); (168) holds as $R_{S_1|Z}(D_1)$ is convex and monotone in D_1.

By defining a discrete random variable $\tilde{Q}$ uniformly distributed over $\{1, \ldots, n\}$ independent

of everything else, we find that

$$\frac{1}{n}I(X_1^n;Y^n|X_2^n,Z^n) \le \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n}(H(Y_i|X_{2i},Z^n) - H(Y_i|X_{1i},X_{2i},Z^n)) \tag{174}$$

$$= \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n} I(X_{1i};Y_i|X_{2i},\tilde{Q}=i,Z^n) \tag{175}$$

$$= I(X_{1\tilde{Q}};Y_{\tilde{Q}}|X_{2\tilde{Q}},\tilde{Q},Z^n) \tag{176}$$

$$= I(X_1;Y|X_2,Q) \tag{177}$$

where we let $X_1 = X_{1\tilde{Q}}$, $X_2 = X_{2\tilde{Q}}$, $Y = Y_{\tilde{Q}}$ and $Q = (\tilde{Q}, Z^n)$. Combining (159), (168), and (174) with (255) yields (7).

Following similar steps we obtain (8),

$$R_{S_2|Z}(D_2+\epsilon) \le I(X_2;Y|X_1,Q). \tag{178}$$

Lastly, we have

$$\frac{1}{n}I(X_1^n,X_2^n;Y^n|Z^n) = \frac{1}{n}I(X_1^n;Y^n|X_2^n,Z^n) + \frac{1}{n}I(X_2^n;Y^n|Z^n) \tag{179}$$

$$\ge R_{S_1|Z}(D_1+\epsilon) + \frac{1}{n}I(S_2^n;Y^n|Z^n) \tag{180}$$

$$\ge R_{S_1|Z}(D_1+\epsilon) + R_{S_2|Z}(D_2+\epsilon) \tag{181}$$

where the first term in (180) is from (159)-(168), and (181) follows from the same steps in (161)-(168) with the role of S_1 changed with S_2. To obtain the second term in (180), we first show that $Y^n - Z^n X_2^n - S_2^n$:

$$p(y^n,s_2^n|z^n,x_2^n) = p(s_2^n|z^n,x_2^n)p(y^n|s_2^n,z^n,x_2^n) \tag{182}$$

$$= p(s_2^n|z^n,x_2^n)\sum_{s_1^n,x_1^n} p(y^n,s_1^n,x_1^n|s_2^n,z^n,x_2^n) \tag{183}$$

$$= p(s_2^n|z^n,x_2^n)\sum_{s_1^n,x_1^n} p(y^n|x_1^n,x_2^n,s_1^n,s_2^n,z^n)$$

$$p(x_1^n|s_1^n,s_2^n,z^n,x_2^n)p(s_1^n|s_2^n,z^n,x_2^n) \tag{184}$$

$$= p(s_2^n|z^n,x_2^n)\sum_{s_1^n,x_1^n} p(y^n|x_1^n,x_2^n)p(x_1^n|s_1^n,z^n)p(s_1^n|z^n) \tag{185}$$

$$= p(s_2^n|z^n, x_2^n) \sum_{s_1^n, x_1^n} p(y^n|x_1^n, x_2^n) p(x_1^n, s_1^n|z^n) \tag{186}$$

$$= p(s_2^n|z^n, x_2^n) \sum_{x_1^n} p(y^n|x_1^n, x_2^n) p(x_1^n|z^n) \tag{187}$$

(185) is from $Y^n - X_1^n X_2^n - S_1^n S_2^n Z^n$ and $X_1^n - S_1^n Z^n - S_2^n X_2^n$ as well as $S_1^n - Z^n - S_2^n X_2^n$ which holds since

$$p(s_1^n, s_2^n, x_2^n|z^n) = p(x_2^n|s_1^n, s_2^n, z^n) p(s_2^n|z^n) p(s_1^n|z^n) \tag{188}$$

$$= p(x_2^n|s_2^n, z^n) p(s_2^n|z^n) p(s_1^n|z^n) \tag{189}$$

$$= p(x_2^n, s_2^n|z^n) p(s_1^n|z^n). \tag{190}$$

(188) is from $S_1^n - Z^n - S_2^n$ and (189) from $X_2^n - S_2^n Z^n - S_1^n$. Note that

$$p(y^n|z^n, x_2^n) = \sum_{s_1^n, x_1^n} p(y^n, s_1^n, x_1^n|z^n, x_2^n) \tag{191}$$

$$= \sum_{s_1^n, x_1^n} p(y^n|x_1^n, x_2^n) p(x_1^n|s_1^n, z^n, x_2^n) p(s_1^n|z^n, x_2^n) \tag{192}$$

$$= \sum_{s_1^n, x_1^n} p(y^n|x_1^n, x_2^n) p(x_1^n|s_1^n, z^n) p(s_1^n|z^n) \tag{193}$$

$$= \sum_{x_1^n} p(y^n|x_1^n, x_2^n) p(x_1^n|z^n). \tag{194}$$

(193) is from $X_1^n - S_1^n Z^n - X_2^n$ and $S_1^n - Z^n - X_2^n$ holds since $S_1^n - Z^n - S_2^n X_2^n$. Combining (194) and (187), we have

$$p(y^n, s_2^n|z^n, x_2^n) = p(s_2^n|z^n, x_2^n) p(y^n|z^n, x_2^n) \tag{195}$$

hence $Y^n - Z^n X_2^n - S_2^n$. Then, we use the following in (179),

$$I(X_2^n; Y^n|Z^n) = H(Y^n|Z^n) - H(Y^n|X_2^n, Z^n) \tag{196}$$

$$= H(Y^n|Z^n) - H(Y^n|X_2^n, Z^n, S_2^n) \tag{197}$$

$$\geq H(Y^n|Z^n) - H(Y^n|Z^n, S_2^n) \tag{198}$$

$$= I(S_2^n; Y^n|Z^n). \tag{199}$$

(197) is from $Y^n - Z^n X_2^n - S_2^n$ and (198) holds since conditioning cannot increase entropy, which leads to (180). Moreover, we have

$$\frac{1}{n} I(X_1^n, X_2^n; Y^n|Z^n) \leq \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} (H(Y_i|Z^n) - H(Y_i|X_{1i}, X_{2i}, Z^n)) \tag{200}$$

$$= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} I(X_{1i}, X_{2i}; Y_i|\tilde{Q} = i, Z^n) \tag{201}$$

$$\leq I(X_{1\tilde{Q}}, X_{2\tilde{Q}}; Y_{\tilde{Q}}|\tilde{Q}, Z^n) \tag{202}$$

$$\leq I(X_1, X_2; Y|Q) \tag{203}$$

where $X_1 = X_{1\tilde{Q}}$, $X_2 = X_{2\tilde{Q}}$, $Y = Y_{\tilde{Q}}$ and $Q = (\tilde{Q}, Z^n)$.

Combining (179), (181) and (200) with (267) recovers (9).

Lastly, we show that $p(x_1, x_2|q) = p(x_1|q)p(x_2|q)$ along the lines of [7]. For $q = (i, z^n)$,

$$P(X_1 = x_1, X_2 = x_2|Q = q) = P(X_{1i} = x_1, X_{2i} = x_2|\tilde{Q} = i, Z^n = z^n) \tag{204}$$

$$= P(X_{1i} = x_1|\tilde{Q} = i, Z^n = z^n) P(X_{2i} = x_2|\tilde{Q} = i, Z^n = z^n) \tag{205}$$

$$= P(X_1 = x_1|Q = q) P(X_2 = x_2|Q = q) \tag{206}$$

where (205) holds since $X_{1i} - Z^n - X_{2i}$ for $i = 1, \ldots, n$ as follows.

$$p(x_1^n, x_2^n|z^n) = \sum_{s_1^n, s_2^n} p(x_1^n, x_2^n, s_1^n, s_2^n|z^n) \tag{207}$$

$$= \sum_{s_1^n, s_2^n} p(x_1^n|s_1^n, z^n) p(x_2^n|s_2^n, z^n) p(s_1^n|z^n) p(s_2^n|z^n) \tag{208}$$

$$= \sum_{s_1^n, s_2^n} p(x_1^n, s_1^n|z^n) p(x_2^n, s_2^n|z^n) \tag{209}$$

$$= p(x_1^n|z^n) p(x_2^n|z^n) \tag{210}$$

where (208) is from $X_1^n - S_1^n Z^n - S_2^n X_2^n$ and $X_2^n - S_2^n Z^n - S_1^n$ as well as $S_1^n - Z^n - S_2^n$. From (210), we observe that $X_1^n - Z^n - X_2^n$, which implies $X_{1i} - Z^n - X_{2i}$.

APPENDIX C
PROOF OF REMARK 1

$S_1 - Z - S_2$ holds if and only if $p(s_1|s_2, z) = p(s_1|z)$. Note that for the Gaussian vector (S_1, S_2, Z), we have that $(S_2, Z) \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu_{S_2Z}, K_{S_2Z})$ with mean $\mu_{S_2Z} = (0, 0)$ and covariance

$$K_{S_2Z} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbb{E}[S_2^2] & \mathbb{E}[S_2Z] \\ \mathbb{E}[ZS_2] & \mathbb{E}[Z^2] \end{bmatrix}. \tag{211}$$

It follows that $S_1|S_2, Z \sim \mathcal{N}(\mathbb{E}[S_1|S_2, Z], \text{var}(S_1|S_2, Z))$ is Gaussian distributed with mean

$$\mathbb{E}[S_1|S_2, Z] = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbb{E}[S_1S_2] & \mathbb{E}[S_1Z] \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbb{E}[S_2^2] & \mathbb{E}[S_2Z] \\ \mathbb{E}[ZS_2] & \mathbb{E}[Z^2] \end{bmatrix}^{-1} \begin{bmatrix} S_2 \\ Z \end{bmatrix} \tag{212}$$

$$= \left(\frac{\mathbb{E}[S_1S_2]\mathbb{E}[Z^2] - \mathbb{E}[S_1Z]\mathbb{E}[S_2Z]}{\mathbb{E}[S_2^2]\mathbb{E}[Z^2] - \mathbb{E}^2[S_2Z]} \right) S_2 + \left(\frac{\mathbb{E}[S_1Z]\mathbb{E}[S_2^2] - \mathbb{E}[S_1S_2]\mathbb{E}[S_2Z]}{\mathbb{E}[S_2^2]\mathbb{E}[Z^2] - \mathbb{E}^2[S_2Z]} \right) Z \tag{213}$$

and variance

$$\text{var}(S_1|S_2, Z) = \mathbb{E}[S_1^2] - \begin{bmatrix} \mathbb{E}[S_1S_2] & \mathbb{E}[S_1Z] \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbb{E}[S_2^2] & \mathbb{E}[S_2Z] \\ \mathbb{E}[ZS_2] & \mathbb{E}[Z^2] \end{bmatrix}^{-1} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbb{E}[S_2S_1] \\ \mathbb{E}[ZS_1] \end{bmatrix}$$

$$= \mathbb{E}[S_1^2] - \frac{\mathbb{E}^2[S_1S_2]\mathbb{E}[Z^2] + \mathbb{E}^2[S_1S_3]\mathbb{E}[S_2^2]}{\mathbb{E}[S_2^2]\mathbb{E}[Z^2] - \mathbb{E}^2[S_2Z]} + \frac{2\mathbb{E}[S_1S_2]\mathbb{E}[S_1S_3]\mathbb{E}[S_2S_3]}{\mathbb{E}[S_2^2]\mathbb{E}[Z^2] - \mathbb{E}^2[S_2Z]} \tag{214}$$

Similarly, since $(S_1, Z) \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu_{S_1Z}, K_{S_1Z})$ is jointly Gaussian with mean $\mu_{S_1Z} = (0, 0)$ and covariance

$$K_{S_1Z} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbb{E}[S_1^2] & \mathbb{E}[S_1Z] \\ \mathbb{E}[ZS_1] & \mathbb{E}[Z^2] \end{bmatrix} \tag{215}$$

we have that $S_1|Z \sim \mathcal{N}(\mathbb{E}[S_1|Z], \text{var}(S_1|Z))$ such that

$$\mathbb{E}[S_1|Z] = \frac{\mathbb{E}[S_1Z]Z}{\mathbb{E}[Z^2]} \tag{216}$$

$$\text{var}(S_1|Z) = \mathbb{E}[S_1^2] - \frac{\mathbb{E}^2[S_1Z]}{\mathbb{E}[Z^2]}. \tag{217}$$

Then, we know that $p(s_1|s_2, z) = p(s_1|z)$ if and only if

$$i)\ \mathbb{E}[S_1|S_2, Z] = \mathbb{E}[S_1|Z] \tag{218}$$

$$ii)\ \text{var}(S_1|S_2,Z)=\text{var}(S_1|Z) \tag{219}$$

hold. By comparing (213) with (216), condition (218) leads to

$$\frac{\mathbb{E}[S_1Z]}{\mathbb{E}[Z^2]}Z=\left(\frac{\mathbb{E}[S_1S_2]\mathbb{E}[Z^2]-\mathbb{E}[S_1Z]\mathbb{E}[S_2Z]}{\mathbb{E}[S_2^2]\mathbb{E}[Z^2]-\mathbb{E}^2[S_2Z]}\right)S_2+\left(\frac{\mathbb{E}[S_1Z]\mathbb{E}[S_2^2]-\mathbb{E}[S_1S_2]\mathbb{E}[S_2Z]}{\mathbb{E}[S_2^2]\mathbb{E}[Z^2]-\mathbb{E}^2[S_2Z]}\right)Z \tag{220}$$

which holds if and only if

$$\frac{\mathbb{E}[S_1S_2]\mathbb{E}[Z^2]-\mathbb{E}[S_1Z]\mathbb{E}[S_2Z]}{\mathbb{E}[S_2^2]\mathbb{E}[Z^2]-\mathbb{E}^2[S_2Z]}=0 \tag{221}$$

and

$$\frac{\mathbb{E}[S_1Z]}{\mathbb{E}[Z^2]}=\frac{\mathbb{E}[S_1Z]\mathbb{E}[S_2^2]-\mathbb{E}[S_1S_2]\mathbb{E}[S_2Z]}{\mathbb{E}[S_2^2]\mathbb{E}[Z^2]-\mathbb{E}^2[S_2Z]} \tag{222}$$

from which (11) and (12) follows, respectively.

By combining (214) and (217), we find that (219) leads to

$$\mathbb{E}[S_1^2]-\frac{\mathbb{E}^2[S_1Z]}{\mathbb{E}[Z^2]}=\mathbb{E}[S_1^2]-\frac{\mathbb{E}^2[S_1S_2]\mathbb{E}[Z^2]-2\mathbb{E}[S_1S_2]\mathbb{E}[S_1S_3]\mathbb{E}[S_2S_3]+\mathbb{E}^2[S_1S_3]\mathbb{E}[S_2^2]}{\mathbb{E}[S_2^2]\mathbb{E}[Z^2]-\mathbb{E}^2[S_2Z]} \tag{223}$$

from which we obtain (13).

APPENDIX D
PROOF OF THEOREM 3

Our proof below heavily uses techniques from [9].

A. Achievability

Source coding is based on lossy compression of a source with decoder side information and common reconstruction constraint, [9], which is based on a special case of Wyner-Ziv source coding as $\hat{S}_j$ satisfies the Markov relation $\hat{S}_j-S_j-Z$ for $j=1,2$. Channel coding is based on multiple access channel coding.

B. Converse

Suppose there exist encoding functions $e_j:\mathcal{S}_j^n\to\mathcal{X}_j^n$ for encoder $j=1,2$, decoding functions $g_j:\mathcal{Y}^n\times\mathcal{Z}^n\to\hat{\mathcal{S}}_j^n$ such that $\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n\mathbb{E}[d_j(S_{ji},\hat{S}_{ji})]\leq D_j+\epsilon$ for $j=1,2$ where $\epsilon\to 0$ as

$n \to \infty$. Lastly, suppose that reconstruction functions $\psi_j : \mathcal{S}_j^n \to \bar{\mathcal{S}}_j^n$ exist for encoder $j = 1, 2$ such that $P(\bar{S}_j^n \neq \hat{S}_j^n) \leq P_{ej}$ where $P_{ej} \to 0$ as $n \to \infty$.

From Fano's inequality,

$$H(\psi_j(S_j)|g_j(Y^n, Z^n)) \leq h(P_{ej}) + P_{ej} \log(|\psi(S_j^n)| - 1) \tag{224}$$

$$\leq h(P_{ej}) + nP_{ej} \log(|\bar{\mathcal{S}}_j|) \tag{225}$$

$$= n\delta(P_{ej}) \tag{226}$$

where $\delta(P_{ej}) \to 0$ as $P_{ej} \to 0$ for $j = 1, 2$.

Next, define the event

$$\mathcal{B} = \{\psi_1(S_1^n) \neq g_1(Y^n, Z^n)\}. \tag{227}$$

By definition, $P(\mathcal{B}) \leq P_{e1}$. Let $\psi_{1i}(S_1^n)$ denote the ith entry of $\psi_1(S_1^n)$, and define

$$\hat{S}_{1i} = \psi_{1i}(S_1^n). \tag{228}$$

Lastly, define $g_{1i}(Y^n, Z^n)$ as the ith entry of $g_1(Y^n, Z^n)$. Then,

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \mathbb{E}[d_1(S_{1i}, \hat{S}_{1i})]$$

$$= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \Big(\mathbb{E}[d_1(S_{1i}, \hat{S}_{1i})|\mathcal{B}^c] P(\mathcal{B}^c) + \mathbb{E}[d_1(S_{1i}, \hat{S}_{1i})|\mathcal{B}] P(\mathcal{B}) \Big) \tag{229}$$

$$\leq \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \mathbb{E}[d_1(S_{1i}, \hat{S}_{1i})|\mathcal{B}^c] P(\mathcal{B}^c) + d_{1,\max} P_{e1} \tag{230}$$

$$= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \mathbb{E}[d_1(S_{1i}, g_{1i}(Y^n, Z^n))|\mathcal{B}^c] P(\mathcal{B}^c) + d_{1,\max} P_{e1} \tag{231}$$

$$\leq \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} (\mathbb{E}[d_1(S_{1i}, g_{1i}(Y^n, Z^n)|\mathcal{B}] P(\mathcal{B}) + \mathbb{E}[d_1(S_{1i}, g_{1i}(Y^n, Z^n)|\mathcal{B}^c] P(\mathcal{B}^c)) + d_{1,\max} P_{e1} \tag{232}$$

$$= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \mathbb{E}[d_1(S_{1i}, g_{1i}(Y^n, Z^n)] + d_{1,\max} P_{e1} \tag{233}$$

$$\leq D_1 + \epsilon + d_{1,\max} P_{e1} \tag{234}$$

where $d_{1,\max} = \max_{s_1 \in \mathcal{S}_1, \hat{s}_1 \in \hat{\mathcal{S}}_1} d_1(s_1, \hat{s}_1)$.

Then, we can find that

$$\frac{1}{n}I(X_1^n;Y^n|X_2^n,Z^n) \geq \frac{1}{n}I(S_1^n;Y^n|X_2^n,Z^n) \tag{235}$$

$$= \frac{1}{n}I(S_1^n;Y^n,X_2^n|Z^n) \tag{236}$$

$$\geq \frac{1}{n}I(S_1^n;g_1(Y^n,Z^n)|Z^n) \tag{237}$$

$$= \frac{1}{n}\big[I(S_1^n;g_1(Y^n,Z^n),\psi_1(S_1^n)|Z^n) - I(S_1^n;\psi_1(S_1^n)|Z^n,g_1(Y^n,Z^n))\big] \tag{238}$$

$$= \frac{1}{n}\big[I(S_1^n;g_1(Y^n,Z^n),\psi_1(S_1^n)|Z^n) - H(\psi_1(S_1^n)|Z^n,g_1(Y^n,Z^n))\big] \tag{239}$$

$$\geq \frac{1}{n}\big[I(S_1^n;g_1(Y^n,Z^n),\psi_1(S_1^n)|Z^n) - H(\psi_1(S_1^n)|g_1(Y^n,Z^n))\big] \tag{240}$$

$$\geq \frac{1}{n}\big[I(S_1^n;g_1(Y^n,Z^n),\psi_1(S_1^n)|Z^n) - n\delta(P_{e1})\big] \tag{241}$$

$$\geq \frac{1}{n}\big[I(S_1^n;\psi_1(S_1^n)|Z^n) - n\delta(P_{e1})\big] \tag{242}$$

$$= \frac{1}{n}\big[I(\psi_1(S_1^n);S_1^n) - I(\psi_1(S_1^n);Z^n) - n\delta(P_{e1})\big] \tag{243}$$

where (241) follows from (226); and (243) follows since $\psi(S_1^n) - S_1^n - Z_1^n$ form a Markov chain. Then, we have

$$\frac{1}{n}\big[I(\psi_1(S_1^n);S_1^n) - I(\psi_1(S_1^n);Z^n) - n\delta(P_{e1})\big] \tag{244}$$

$$= \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\big[I(\psi_1(S_1^n);S_{1i}|S_1^{i-1}) - I(\psi(S_1^n);Z_i|Z_{i+1}^n)) - \delta(P_{e1}\big] \tag{245}$$

$$= \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\big[I(\psi_1(S_1^n),Z_{i+1}^n;S_{1i}|S_1^{i-1}) - I(Z_{i+1}^n;S_{1i}|\psi_1(S_1^n),S_1^{i-1}) - I(\psi(S_1^n),S_1^{i-1};Z_i|Z_{i+1}^n) + I(S_1^{i-1};Z_i|Z_{i+1}^n,\psi(S_1^n))\big] - \delta(P_{e1}) \tag{246}$$

$$\geq \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\big[I(\psi_1(S_1^n),Z_{i+1}^n;S_{1i}|S_1^{i-1}) - I(\psi_1(S_1^n),S_1^{i-1};Z_i|Z_{i+1}^n)\big] - \delta(P_{e1}) \tag{247}$$

$$= \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\big[I(\psi_1(S_1^n),Z_{i+1}^n,S_1^{i-1};S_{1i}) - I(\psi_1(S_1^n),S_1^{i-1},Z_{i+1}^n;Z_i)\big] - \delta(P_{e1}) \tag{248}$$

$$= \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n}I(\psi_1(S_1^n),S_1^{i-1},Z_{i+1}^n;S_{1i}|Z_i) - \delta(P_{e1}) \tag{249}$$

$$\geq \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n} I(\psi_{1i}(S_1^n); S_{1i}|Z_i) - \delta(P_{e1}) \tag{250}$$

$$\geq \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n} I(\bar{S}_{1i}; S_{1i}|Z_i) - \delta(P_{e1}) \tag{251}$$

$$\geq \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n} R^{RC}_{S_1|Z}(\mathbb{E}[d(S_{1i}, \hat{S}_{1i})]) - \delta(P_{e1}) \tag{252}$$

$$\geq R^{RC}_{S_1|Z}\Big(\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\mathbb{E}[d(S_{1i}, \hat{S}_{1i})]\Big) - \delta(P_{e1}) \tag{253}$$

$$\geq R^{RC}_{S_1|Z}(D_1 + \epsilon + d_{1,max}P_{e1}) - \delta(P_{e1}) \tag{254}$$

where (247) follows from Csiszar's sum equality, (249) follows from the fact that $\psi_1(S_1^n)S_1^{i-1}Z_{i+1}^n - S_{1i} - Z_i$ forms a Markov chain, (251) follows from (228), (252) follows from the definition of $R^{RC}_{S_1|Z}$ and the fact that $\bar{S}_{1i} - S_{1i} - Z$ form a Markov chain, and (253) and (254) follow from the convexity and monotonicity of (19).

Lastly, we define an independent discrete random variable $\tilde{Q}$ uniformly distributed over $\{1, \ldots, n\}$ such that

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{1}{n}I(X_1^n; Y^n|X_2^n, Z^n) &\leq \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n} I(X_{1i}; Y_i|X_{2i}, \tilde{Q} = i, Z^n) \\ &= I(X_{1\tilde{Q}}; Y_{\tilde{Q}}|X_{2\tilde{Q}}, \tilde{Q}, Z^n) \\ &= I(X_1; Y|X_2, Q)\end{aligned} \tag{255}$$

where $X_1 = X_{1\tilde{Q}}$, $X_2 = X_{2\tilde{Q}}$, $Y = Y_{\tilde{Q}}$ and $Q = (\tilde{Q}, Z^n)$, and

$$p(y, x_1, x_2|q) = p(y|x_1, x_2)p(x_1|q)p(x_2|q). \tag{256}$$

By combining (235), (243), (254), (255), and (234), we have that

$$R^{RC}_{S_1|Z}(D_1 + \epsilon + d_{1,max}P_{e1}) - \delta(P_{e1}) \leq I(X_1; Y|X_2, Q) \tag{257}$$

where $P_{e1} \to 0$ and $\epsilon \to 0$ as $n \to \infty$.

By following similar steps for source S_2, we can obtain

$$R^{RC}_{S_2|Z}(D_2 + \epsilon + d_{2,max}P_{e2}) - \delta(P_{e2}) \leq I(X_2; Y|X_1, Q) \tag{258}$$

where $P_{e2} \to 0$ and $\epsilon \to 0$ as $n \to \infty$.

Lastly, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{1}{n} I(X_1^n, X_2^n; Y^n|Z^n) \\
&\geq \frac{1}{n} I(S_1^n, S_2^n; Y^n|Z^n) && (259)\\
&= \frac{1}{n}(I(S_1^n; Y^n|Z^n) + I(S_2^n; Y^n|S_1^n, Z^n)) && (260)\\
&= \frac{1}{n}(I(S_1^n; Y^n|Z^n) + I(S_1^n; g_1(Y^n, Z^n)|Y^n, Z^n) \\
&\qquad + I(S_2^n; Y^n|S_1^n, Z^n) + I(S_2^n; g_2(Y^n, Z^n)|S_1^n, Y^n, Z^n)) && (261)\\
&= \frac{1}{n}(I(S_1^n; Y^n, g_1(Y^n, Z^n)|Z^n) + I(S_2^n; Y^n, g_2(Y^n, Z^n)|S_1^n, Z^n)) && (262)\\
&\geq \frac{1}{n}(I(S_1^n; g_1(Y^n, Z^n)|Z^n) + I(S_2^n; g_2(Y^n, Z^n)|S_1^n, Z^n)) && (263)\\
&\geq \frac{1}{n}(I(S_1^n; g_1(Y^n, Z^n)|Z^n) + H(S_2^n|Z^n) - H(S_2^n|g_2(Y^n, Z^n), Z^n)) && (264)\\
&= \frac{1}{n}(I(S_1^n; g_1(Y^n, Z^n)|Z^n) + I(S_2^n; g_2(Y^n, Z^n)|Z^n)) && (265)\\
&\geq R_{S_1|Z}^{RC}(D_1 + \epsilon + d_{1,max}P_{e1}) + R_{S_2|Z}^{RC}(D_2 + \epsilon + d_{2,max}P_{e2}) - \delta(P_{e1}) - \delta(P_{e2}) && (266)
\end{aligned}$$

and the steps between (265) and (266) follow as in (237)-(254). Lastly, by using the fact that

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{1}{n} I(X_1^n, X_2^n; Y^n|Z^n) &\leq \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} I(X_{1i}, X_{2i}; Y_i|\tilde{Q} = i, Z^n) \\
&= I(X_1, X_2; Y|Q) && (267)
\end{aligned}$$

we have

$$R_{S_1|Z}^{RC}(D_1 + \epsilon + d_{1,max}P_{e1}) + R_{S_2|Z}^{RC}(D_2 + \epsilon + d_{2,max}P_{e2}) - \delta(P_{e1}) - \delta(P_{e2}) \leq I(X_1, X_2; Y|Q). \quad (268)$$

Then the converse follows from letting $n \to \infty$.

APPENDIX E
PROOF OF THEOREM 4

A. Achievability

Our source coding part is based on the distributed source coding scheme with a common part from [19, Theorem 1]. Initially, let $Y_0 \leftarrow Z$, $Y_j \leftarrow (S_j, Z)$ for $j = 1, 2$, and $X \leftarrow Z$ in Fig. 3 in [19] and observe that any achievable rate for this system is also achievable by our system. This follows from the fact that Y_0, which is to be reconstructed losslessly in [19], is known by both encoders in our system as $Y_0 \leftarrow Z$ and that Z is available to both encoders. Hence, the encoders can cooperate to send Y_0 to the decoder and realize any achievable scheme in [19].

Letting $U = X$ in [19, Theorem 1] and substituting $X \leftarrow Z$, $Y_0 \leftarrow Z$, $\hat{Y}_0 \leftarrow \hat{Z}$, $Y_j \leftarrow (S_j, Z)$, $V_j \leftarrow U_j$, $\hat{Y}_j \leftarrow \hat{S}_j$, and $d_j(Y_j, \hat{Y}_j) \leftarrow d_j(S_j, \hat{S}_j)$ for $j = 1, 2$, we find that a distortion pair (D_1, D_2) is achievable for the rate triplet (R_0, R_1, R_2) if

$$R_0 \geq H(Z|Z, U_1, U_2) \tag{269}$$

$$R_1 \geq I(S_1, Z; U_1|Z, U_2) \tag{270}$$

$$R_2 \geq I(S_2, Z; U_2|Z, U_1) \tag{271}$$

$$R_0 + R_1 \geq H(Z|Z, U_2) + I(S_1, Z; U_1|Z, U_2) \tag{272}$$

$$R_0 + R_2 \geq H(Z|Z, U_1) + I(S_2, Z; U_2|Z, U_1) \tag{273}$$

$$R_1 + R_2 \geq I(S_1, S_2, Z; U_1, U_2, Z|Z) \tag{274}$$

$$R_0 + R_1 + R_2 \geq H(Z) + I(S_1, S_2, Z; U_1, U_2, Z|Z) \tag{275}$$

and $\mathbb{E}[d_j(S_j, \hat{S}_j)] \leq D_j$ for $j = 1, 2$, for some distribution

$$p(z, s_1, s_2, u_1, u_2, \hat{s}_1, \hat{s}_2) = p(z, s_1, s_2)p(u_1|s_1, z)p(u_2|s_2, z)p(\hat{s}_1, \hat{s}_2|z, u_1, u_2). \tag{276}$$

Note that since $H(Z|Z, U_1, U_2) = 0$, the condition (269) can be removed without loss of generality. We next write (270) as,

$$R_1 \geq I(S_1, Z; U_1|Z, U_2) \tag{277}$$

$$= I(S_1; U_1|Z, U_2) + I(Z; U_1|Z, U_2, S_1) \tag{278}$$

$$= H(U_1|Z, U_2) - H(U_1|S_1, Z, U_2) \tag{279}$$

$$= H(U_1|Z) - H(U_1|S_1, Z) \tag{280}$$

$$= I(S_1; U_1|Z) \tag{281}$$

where (279) holds because $I(Z; U_1|Z, U_2, S_1) = 0$ since

$$I(Z; A|Z, B) = H(Z|Z, B) - H(Z|Z, B, A) = 0 \tag{282}$$

for any random variable A and B, (280) is from $U_1 - S_1Z - U_2$ and $U_1 - Z - U_2$ since

$$p(u_1, u_2|z) = \sum_{s_1,s_2} p(u_1, u_2, s_1, s_2|z) \tag{283}$$

$$= \sum_{s_1,s_2} p(u_1|s_1, z)p(u_2|s_2, z)p(s_1|z)p(s_2|z) \tag{284}$$

$$= \sum_{s_1,s_2} p(u_1, s_1|z)p(u_2, s_2|z) \tag{285}$$

$$= p(u_1|z)p(u_2|z) \tag{286}$$

where (284) is from $U_1 - S_1Z - S_2U_2$ and $U_2 - S_2Z - S_1$ as well as $S_1 - Z - S_2$.

Noting that $H(Z|Z, U_2) = 0$ and following the steps in (277)-(281), we can write (272) as

$$R_0 + R_1 \geq I(S_1; U_1|Z) \tag{287}$$

which, by comparing it with (281), indicates that condition (272) can be removed without loss of generality.

Following similar steps, we can write (271) as

$$R_2 \geq I(S_2; U_2|Z) \tag{288}$$

and (273) as

$$R_0 + R_2 \geq I(S_2; U_2|Z) \tag{289}$$

which, by comparing it with (288), shows that condition (273) can also be removed. For (274)

and (275), we find that

$$I(S_1, S_2, Z; U_1, U_2, Z|Z) = I(S_1, S_2; U_1, U_2, Z|Z) + I(Z; U_1, U_2, Z|Z, S_1, S_2) \tag{290}$$

$$= I(S_1, S_2; U_1, U_2|Z) + I(S_1, S_2; Z|Z, U_1, U_2) \tag{291}$$

$$= I(S_1, S_2; U_1, U_2|Z) \tag{292}$$

$$= H(U_1, U_2|Z) - H(U_1, U_2|Z, S_1, S_2) \tag{293}$$

$$= H(U_1|Z) + H(U_2|Z, U_1) - H(U_1|Z, S_1, S_2) - H(U_2|Z, S_1, S_2, U_1) \tag{294}$$

$$= H(U_1|Z) + H(U_2|Z, U_1) - H(U_1|Z, S_1) - H(U_2|Z, S_2) \tag{295}$$

$$= H(U_1|Z) + H(U_2|Z) - H(U_1|Z, S_1) - H(U_2|Z, S_2) \tag{296}$$

$$= I(S_1; U_1|Z) + I(S_2; U_2|Z) \tag{297}$$

where (291) holds as a result of $I(Z; U_1, U_2, Z|Z, S_1, S_2) = 0$ from (282); (292) holds since $I(S_1, S_2; Z|Z, U_1, U_2) = 0$ from (282); (295) holds as $U_1 - ZS_1 - S_2$ and $U_2 - ZS_2 - S_1U_1$; and (296) follows from $U_1 - Z - U_2$ shown in (286).

Combining (281), (287), (288), and (289) with (297), we can now restate (269)-(276) as follows.

A distortion pair (D_1, D_2) is achievable for the rate triplet (R_0, R_1, R_2) if

$$R_1 \geq I(S_1; U_1|Z) \tag{298}$$

$$R_2 \geq I(S_2; U_2|Z) \tag{299}$$

$$R_1 + R_2 \geq I(S_1; U_1|Z) + I(S_2; U_2|Z) \tag{300}$$

$$R_0 + R_1 + R_2 \geq H(Z) + I(S_1; U_1|Z) + I(S_2; U_2|Z) \tag{301}$$

and $\mathbb{E}[d_j(S_j, \hat{S}_j)] \leq D_j$ for $j = 1, 2$, for some distribution

$$p(z, s_1, s_2)p(u_1|s_1, z)p(u_2|s_2, z)p(\hat{s}_1, \hat{s}_2|z, u_1, u_2). \tag{302}$$

We next show that one can set $\hat{S}_j = f_j(Z, U_1, U_2)$ for $j = 1, 2$ without loss of optimality. To

do so, we write

$$\mathbb{E}[d_1(S_1,\hat{S}_1)] = \sum_{s_1,\hat{s}_1} p(s_1,\hat{s}_1)d_1(s_1,\hat{s}_1) \tag{303}$$

$$= \sum_{s_1,\hat{s}_1,\hat{s}_2,z,u_1,u_2} p(\hat{s}_1,\hat{s}_2|z,u_1,u_2,s_1)p(z,u_1,u_2,s_1)d_1(s_1,\hat{s}_1) \tag{304}$$

$$= \sum_{s_1,\hat{s}_1,\hat{s}_2,z,u_1,u_2} p(\hat{s}_1,\hat{s}_2|z,u_1,u_2)p(z,u_1,u_2,s_1)d_1(s_1,\hat{s}_1) \tag{305}$$

$$= \sum_{z,u_1,u_2}\sum_{\hat{s}_1}\sum_{s_1} p(\hat{s}_1|z,u_1,u_2)p(z,u_1,u_2,s_1)d_1(s_1,\hat{s}_1) \tag{306}$$

$$\geq \sum_{z,u_1,u_2,s_1} p(z,u_1,u_2,s_1)d_1(s_1,f_1(z,u_1,u_2)) \tag{307}$$

$$= \mathbb{E}[d_1(S_1,f_1(Z,U_1,U_2))] \tag{308}$$

where we define a function $f_1 : \mathcal{Z}\times\mathcal{U}_1\times\mathcal{U}_2 \to \hat{\mathcal{S}}_1$ in (307) such that,

$$f_1(z,u_1,u_2) = \arg\min_{\hat{s}_1} \sum_{s_1} p(z,u_1,u_2,s_1)d_1(s_1,\hat{s}_1) \tag{309}$$

and set $p(\hat{s}_1|z,u_1,u_2) = 1$ for $\hat{s}_1 = f_1(z,u_1,u_2)$ and $p(\hat{s}_1|z,u_1,u_2) = 0$ otherwise.

A similar argument follows for S_2 by defining a function $f_2 : \mathcal{Z}\times\mathcal{U}_1\times\mathcal{U}_2 \to \hat{\mathcal{S}}_2$ leading to

$$\mathbb{E}[d_2(S_2,\hat{S}_2)] \geq \mathbb{E}[d_2(S_2,f_2(Z,U_1,U_2))]. \tag{310}$$

Therefore, we can set $\hat{S}_j = f_j(Z,U_1,U_2)$ for $j = 1,2$.

We next show for $j = 1,2$ that whenever there exists a function $f_j(Z,U_1,U_2)$ such that

$$\mathbb{E}[d_j(S_j,f_j(Z,U_1,U_2))] \leq D_j, \tag{311}$$

then there exists a function $g_j(Z,U_j)$ such that

$$\mathbb{E}[d_j(S_j,g_j(Z,U_j))] \leq \mathbb{E}[d_j(S_j,f_j(Z,U_1,U_2))] \leq D_j. \tag{312}$$

We show this result along the lines of [20]. Consider a function $f_1(Z,U_1,U_2)$ such that $\mathbb{E}[d_1(S_1,f_1(Z,U_1,U_2))] \leq D_1$. From the law of iterated expectations,

$$\mathbb{E}[d_1(S_1,f_1(Z,U_1,U_2))] = \mathbb{E}_{S_2,U_2,Z}[\mathbb{E}_{S_1,U_1|S_2,U_2,Z}[d_1(S_1,f_1(Z,U_1,U_2))]] \tag{313}$$

$$= \mathbb{E}_{S_2,U_2,Z}[\mathbb{E}_{S_1,U_1|Z}[d_1(S_1, f_1(Z, U_1, U_2))]] \tag{314}$$

(314) holds due to $U_1 S_1 - Z - U_2 S_2$, which can be observed from (283)-(285). Define a function $\phi : \mathcal{Z} \to \mathcal{U}_2$ such that

$$\phi(z) = \arg\min_{u_2} \mathbb{E}_{S_1,U_1|Z=z}[d_1(S_1, f_1(z, U_1, u_2))], \tag{315}$$

then for each $Z = z$,

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E}_{S_2,U_2|Z=z}[\mathbb{E}_{S_1,U_1|Z=z}[d_1(S_1, f_1(z, U_1, U_2))]] \\ &\qquad \geq \mathbb{E}_{S_1,U_1|Z=z}[d_1(S_1, f_1(z, U_1, \phi(z)))] \end{aligned} \tag{316}$$

hence

$$\mathbb{E}[d_1(S_1, f_1(Z, U_1, U_2))] = \mathbb{E}_Z[\mathbb{E}_{S_2,U_2|Z=z}[\mathbb{E}_{S_1,U_1|Z=z}[d_1(S_1, f_1(z, U_1, U_2))]]] \tag{317}$$

$$\geq \mathbb{E}_Z[\mathbb{E}_{S_1,U_1|Z=z}[d_1(S_1, f_1(z, U_1, \phi(z)))]] \tag{318}$$

$$= \mathbb{E}_{S_1,U_1,Z}[d_1(S_1, f_1(Z, U_1, \phi(Z)))] \tag{319}$$

$$= \mathbb{E}[d_1(S_1, g_1(Z, U_1))] \tag{320}$$

where $g_1(Z, U_1) = f_1(Z, U_1, \phi(Z))$.

Following similar steps, for any $f_2(Z, U_1, U_2)$ that achieves $\mathbb{E}[d_2(S_2, f_2(Z, U_1, U_2))] \leq D_2$ we can find a function $g_2(Z, U_2)$ such that

$$\mathbb{E}[d_2(S_2, f_2(Z, U_1, U_2))] \geq \mathbb{E}[d_2(S_2, g_2(Z, U_2))] \tag{321}$$

Combining (308), (310), (320), and (321) with (2) and (3), we can state the rate region in (298)-(301) as follows.

A distortion pair (D_1, D_2) is achievable for the rate triplet (R_0, R_1, R_2) if

$$R_1 \geq R_{S_1|Z}(D_1) \tag{322}$$

$$R_2 \geq R_{S_2|Z}(D_2) \tag{323}$$

$$R_1 + R_2 \geq R_{S_1|Z}(D_1) + R_{S_2|Z}(D_2) \tag{324}$$

$$R_0 + R_1 + R_2 \geq H(Z) + R_{S_1|Z}(D_1) + R_{S_2|Z}(D_2) \tag{325}$$

since for any $p(s_j,u_j,z)=p(u_j|s_j,z)p(s_j|z)p(z)$ and $g_j(z,u_j)$ with $\mathbb{E}[d_j(S_j,g_j(Z,U_j))]\le D_j$,

$$I(S_j;U_j|Z)\ge R_{S_j|Z}(D_j),\quad j=1,2 \tag{326}$$

where $R_{S_j|Z}(D_j)$ is defined in (3). This completes the source coding part.

Our channel coding is based on multiple access channel coding with a common message [21], for which any triplet of rates (R_0,R_1,R_2) is achievable if

$$R_1\le I(X_1;Y|X_2,W) \tag{327}$$

$$R_2\le I(X_2;Y|X_1,W) \tag{328}$$

$$R_1+R_2\le I(X_1,X_2;Y|W) \tag{329}$$

$$R_0+R_1+R_2\le I(X_1,X_2;Y) \tag{330}$$

for some $p(x_1,x_2,y,w)=p(y|x_1,x_2)p(x_1|w)p(x_2|w)p(w)$.

B. Converse

Our proof is along the lines of [5] and [6]. Suppose there exist encoding functions $e_j:\mathcal{S}_j^n\times\mathcal{Z}^n\to\mathcal{X}_j^n$ for $j=1,2$, decoding functions $g_j:\mathcal{Y}^n\to\hat{\mathcal{S}}_j^n$ for $j=1,2$ and $g_0:\mathcal{Y}^n\to\hat{Z}^n$ such that $\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n E[d_j(S_{ji},\hat{\mathcal{S}}_{ji})]\le D_j+\epsilon$ for $j=1,2$ and $P(Z^n\ne\hat{Z}^n)\le P_e$ where $\epsilon\to 0$, $P_e\to 0$ as $n\to\infty$.

Define $U_{ji}=(Y^n,S_j^{i-1},Z_i^c)$ for $j=1,2$ where $Z_i^c=(Z_1,\dots,Z_{(i-1)},Z_{(i+1)},\dots,Z_n)$. Then,

$$\frac{1}{n}I(X_1^n;Y^n|X_2^n,Z^n)=\frac{1}{n}(H(Y^n|X_2^n,Z^n)-H(Y^n|X_1^n,X_2^n,Z^n,S_1^n)) \tag{331}$$

$$\ge\frac{1}{n}(H(Y^n|X_2^n,Z^n)-H(Y^n|X_2^n,Z^n,S_1^n)) \tag{332}$$

$$=\frac{1}{n}I(S_1^n;Y^n|X_2^n,Z^n) \tag{333}$$

$$=\frac{1}{n}I(S_1^n;Y^n,X_2^n|Z^n) \tag{334}$$

$$\ge\frac{1}{n}I(S_1^n;Y^n|Z^n) \tag{335}$$

$$=\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n I(S_{1i};Y^n|S_1^{i-1},Z^n) \tag{336}$$

$$=\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n(I(S_{1i};Y^n,S_1^{i-1},Z_i^c|Z_i)-I(S_{1i};S_1^{i-1},Z_i^c|Z_i))$$

$$= \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n} I(S_{1i};U_{1i}|Z_i) \tag{337}$$

$$\geq \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n} R_{S_1|Z}(\mathcal{E}(S_{1i}|U_{1i},Z_i)) \tag{338}$$

$$\geq \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n} R_{S_1|Z}(\mathcal{E}(S_{1i}|Y^n)) \tag{339}$$

$$\geq \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n} R_{S_1|Z}(\mathbb{E}[d_1(S_{1i},\hat{S}_{1i})]) \tag{340}$$

$$\geq R_{S_1|Z}(D_1+\epsilon) \tag{341}$$

(331) is from $Y^n - X_1^n X_2^n - Z^n S_1^n$, (332) holds since conditioning cannot increase entropy, and (334) is from $I(S_1^n;X_2^n|Z^n)=0$ since $S_1^n - Z^n - X_2^n$ as follows.

$$p(x_2^n,s_1^n|z^n) = \sum_{s_2^n} p(x_2^n,s_2^n,s_1^n|z^n) \tag{342}$$

$$= \sum_{s_2^n} p(x_2^n|s_2^n,s_1^n,z^n)p(s_2^n|s_1^n,z^n)p(s_1^n|z^n)$$

$$= \sum_{s_2^n} p(x_2^n|s_2^n,z^n)p(s_2^n|z^n)p(s_1^n|z^n) \tag{343}$$

$$= \sum_{s_2^n} p(x_2^n,s_2^n|z^n)p(s_1^n|z^n) \tag{344}$$

$$= p(x_2^n|z^n)p(s_1^n|z^n) \tag{345}$$

where (343) holds since $X_2^n - S_2^n Z^n - S_1^n$ and $S_1^n - Z^n - S_2^n$. Equation (336) is from the chain rule; (337) is from the definition of U_{1i} and the memoryless property of the sources; (338) is from (2) and (3); (339) is from the fact that conditioning cannot increase (2); (340) follows as $\hat{S}_{1i}$ is a function of Y^n and (341) as $R_{S_1|Z}(D_1)$ is convex and monotone in D_1.

By defining a discrete random variable $\tilde{Q}$ uniformly distributed over $\{1,\ldots,n\}$ independent of everything else, and following steps (174)-(255) by $Q=(\tilde{Q},Z^n)$ replaced with $W=(\tilde{Q},Z^n)$, we find that

$$\frac{1}{n} I(X_1^n;Y^n|X_2^n,Z^n) \leq I(X_1;Y|X_2,W) \tag{346}$$

where $X_1 = X_{1\tilde{Q}}$, $X_2 = X_{2\tilde{Q}}$, $Y = Y_{\tilde{Q}}$.

Combining (346) with (331) and (341) leads to (20).

We obtain (21) by following similar steps.

Next, we show that

$$\frac{1}{n}I(X_1^n, X_2^n; Y^n|Z^n) = \frac{1}{n}(H(Y^n|Z^n) - H(Y^n|Z^n, X_1^n, X_2^n)) \tag{347}$$

$$= \frac{1}{n}(H(Y^n|Z^n) - H(Y^n|Z^n, X_1^n, X_2^n, S_1^n, S_2^n)) \tag{348}$$

$$\geq \frac{1}{n}(H(Y^n|Z^n) - H(Y^n|Z^n, S_1^n, S_2^n)) \tag{349}$$

$$= \frac{1}{n}I(S_1^n, S_2^n; Y^n|Z^n) \tag{350}$$

$$= \frac{1}{n}(I(S_1^n; Y^n|Z^n) + I(S_2^n; Y^n|S_1^n, Z^n))$$

$$= \frac{1}{n}(I(S_1^n; Y^n|Z^n) + H(S_2^n|Z^n) - H(S_2^n|Y^n, S_1^n, Z^n)) \tag{351}$$

$$\geq \frac{1}{n}(I(S_1^n; Y^n|Z^n) + H(S_2^n|Z^n) - H(S_2^n|Y^n, Z^n)) \tag{352}$$

$$= \frac{1}{n}(I(S_1^n; Y^n|Z^n) + I(S_2^n; Y^n|Z^n)) \tag{353}$$

$$\geq R_{S_1|Z}(D_1 + \epsilon) + R_{S_2|Z}(D_2 + \epsilon) \tag{354}$$

where (348) is from $Y^n - X_1^n X_2^n - S_1^n S_2^n Z^n$, (349) is from the fact that conditioning cannot increase entropy, (351) is from $S_2^n - Z^n - S_1^n$, (352) is from conditioning cannot increase entropy, (354) is from following the steps (335)-(341) twice, where the role of S_1^n and S_2^n are changed for the second term.

Then, by replacing $Q = (\tilde{Q}, Z^n)$ with $W = (\tilde{Q}, Z^n)$ in (200)-(267), we can show by following the same steps that,

$$\frac{1}{n}I(X_1^n, X_2^n; Y^n|Z^n) \leq I(X_1, X_2; Y|W) \tag{355}$$

which, by combining with (347) and (354) leads to (22).

We lastly show that

$$\frac{1}{n}I(X_1^n, X_2^n; Y^n) \geq \frac{1}{n}I(S_1^n, S_2^n, Z^n; Y^n) \tag{356}$$

$$= \frac{1}{n}I(S_1^n, Z^n; Y^n) + \frac{1}{n}I(S_2^n; Y^n|S_1^n, Z^n) \tag{357}$$

$$= \frac{1}{n}(I(Z^n; Y^n) + I(S_1^n; Y^n|Z^n) + H(S_2^n|Z^n) - H(S_2^n|Y^n, S_1^n, Z^n)) \tag{358}$$

$$\geq \frac{1}{n}(I(Z^n;Y^n) + I(S_1^n;Y^n|Z^n) + H(S_2^n|Z^n) - H(S_2^n|Y^n,Z^n)) \tag{359}$$

$$= \frac{1}{n}(H(Z^n) - H(Z^n|Y^n) + I(S_1^n;Y^n|Z^n) + I(S_2^n;Y^n|Z^n))$$

$$\geq \frac{1}{n}(H(Z^n) + I(S_1^n;Y^n|Z^n) + I(S_2^n;Y^n|Z^n) - n\delta(P_e)) \tag{360}$$

$$\geq H(Z) + R_{S_1|Z}(D_1+\epsilon) + R_{S_2|Z}(D_2+\epsilon) - \delta(P_e) \tag{361}$$

where (356) is from $Y^n - X_1^n X_2^n - S_1^n S_2^n Z^n$, (358) is from $S_2^n - Z^n - S_1^n$, (359) is from the fact that conditioning cannot increase entropy, (360) is from Fano's inequality combined with the data processing inequality, i.e.,

$$H(Z^n|Y^n) \leq H(Z^n|\hat{Z}^n) \leq n\delta(P_e) \tag{362}$$

where $\delta(P_e) \to 0$ as $P_e \to 0$ [18]. Equation (361) is from the memoryless property of Z^n and from following the steps (335)-(341) twice, the second one is when the role of S_1^n is replaced with S_2^n.

Lastly, using random variable $\tilde{Q}$ that has been defined uniformly over $\{1,\ldots,n\}$ and independent of everything else, we derive the following.

$$\frac{1}{n}I(X_1^n, X_2^n; Y^n) \leq \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n}(H(Y_i) - H(Y_i|X_{1i}, X_{2i})) \tag{363}$$

$$= \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n} I(X_{1i}, X_{2i}; Y_i|\tilde{Q} = i) \tag{364}$$

$$\leq I(X_{1\tilde{Q}}, X_{2\tilde{Q}}; Y_{\tilde{Q}}|\tilde{Q}) \tag{365}$$

$$= I(X_1, X_2; Y|\tilde{Q}) \tag{366}$$

$$\leq H(Y) - H(Y|X_1, X_2) \tag{367}$$

$$= I(X_1, X_2; Y) \tag{368}$$

where $X_1 = X_{1\tilde{Q}}$, $X_2 = X_{2\tilde{Q}}$, $Y = Y_{\tilde{Q}}$. Combining (356), (361), (363), and (368) leads to (23).

In order to complete our proof, we demonstrate that $p(x_1, x_2|w) = p(x_1|w)p(x_2|w)$ for $w = (i, z^n)$ as in (204)-(206). To this end, we show that

$$P(X_1 = x_1, X_2 = x_2|W = w) = P(X_{1i} = x_1, X_{2i} = x_2|\tilde{Q} = i, Z^n = z^n) \tag{369}$$

$$= P(X_{1i}{=}x_1|\tilde{Q}{=}i, Z^n{=}z^n)P(X_{2i}{=}x_2|\tilde{Q}{=}i, Z^n{=}z^n) \quad (370)$$

$$= P(X_1 = x_1|W = w)P(X_2 = x_2|W = w) \quad (371)$$

where (370) holds since $X_{1i} - Z^n - X_{2i}$ for $i = 1, \ldots, n$ due to $S_1^n - Z^n - S_2^n$, which can be observed from following the steps in (207)-(210), which completes the proof.

REFERENCES

[1] P. Gács and J. Körner, "Common information is far less than mutual information," *Problems of Control and Information Theory*, vol. 2, no. 2, pp. 149–162, 1973.

[2] A. Lapidoth and S. Tinguely, "Sending a bivariate Gaussian over a Gaussian MAC," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 56, no. 6, pp. 2714–2752, Jun. 2010.

[3] A. Lapidoth and M. Wigger, "A necessary condition for the transmissibility of correlated sources over a MAC," *IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory, ISIT'16*, pp. 2024–2028, Barcelona, Spain, 2016.

[4] C. E. Shannon, "A mathematical theory of communication," *Bell System Technical Journal*, vol. 27, pp. 379–423, 625–656, July, Oct. 1948.

[5] S. Shamai, S. Verdú, and R. Zamir, "Systematic lossy source/channel coding," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 44, no. 2, pp. 564–579, Mar. 1998.

[6] D. Gündüz and E. Erkip, "Correlated sources over an asymmetric multiple access channel with one distortion criterion," *41st Annual Conference on Information Sciences and Systems, CISS'07*, pp. 325–330, Baltimore, MD, 2007.

[7] D. Gündüz, E. Erkip, A. Goldsmith, and H. V. Poor, "Source and channel coding for correlated sources over multiuser channels," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 55, no. 9, pp. 3927–3944, Sep. 2009.

[8] P. Minero, S. H. Lim, and Y.-H. Kim, "A unified approach to hybrid coding," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 61, no. 4, pp. 1509–1523, Apr. 2015.

[9] Y. Steinberg, "Coding and common reconstruction," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 55, no. 11, pp. 4995–5010, Nov. 2009.

[10] R. M. Gray, *Conditional rate-distortion theory*. Inf. Sys. Laboratory, Stanford Electronics Laboratories, 1972.

[11] A. D. Wyner and J. Ziv, "The rate-distortion function for source coding with side information at the decoder," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 22, no. 1, pp. 1–10, Apr. 1976.

[12] A. D. Wyner, "The common information of two dependent random variables," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 21, no. 2, pp. 163–179, Mar. 1975.

[13] S. I. Bross, A. Lapidoth, and M. A. Wigger, "The Gaussian MAC with conferencing encoders," *IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory, ISIT'08*, pp. 2702–2706, Toronto, Canada, 2008.

[14] G. Xu, W. Liu, and B. Chen, "A lossy source coding interpretation of Wyner's common information," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 62, no. 2, pp. 754–768, Feb. 2016.

[15] A. D. Wyner, "The rate-distortion function for source coding with side information at the decoder-II: General sources," *Information and Control*, vol. 38, no. 1, pp. 60–80, Jul. 1978.

[16] J.-J. Xiao and Z.-Q. Luo, "Compression of correlated Gaussian sources under individual distortion criteria," *43rd Annual Allerton Conference on Communication, Control, and Computing*, Monticello, IL, 2005.

[17] A. El Gamal and Y.-H. Kim, *Network information theory*. Cambridge University Press, 2011.

[18] T. M. Cover and J. A. Thomas, *Elements of information theory*. John Wiley & Sons, 2012.

[19] A. B. Wagner, B. G. Kelly, and Y. Altuğ, "Distributed rate-distortion with common components," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 57, no. 7, pp. 4035–4057, Jul. 2011.

[20] M. Gastpar, "The Wyner-Ziv problem with multiple sources," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 50, no. 11, pp. 2762–2768, Nov. 2004.

[21] D. Slepian and J. K. Wolf, "A coding theorem for multiple access channels with correlated sources," *Bell System Technical Journal*, vol. 52, no. 7, pp. 1037–1076, Sep. 1973.